DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 020 EC 212 112

AUTHOR	Empson, Judith V.; And Others
TITLE	An Impact Evaluation of the Resource Access Projects, 1983-1984.
INSTITUTION	Littlejohn (Roy) Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 84
CONTRACT	HHS-105-82-0008
NOTE	209p.; For earlier versions of this document, see ED 189 799, ED 250 069, and ED 250 077. For the 1986-87 edition, see EC 212 113.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Inservice Education; *Mainstreaming; Management Information Systems; Preschool Education; Program Evaluation; Regional Programs; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The report provides evaluation data (1983-84) for the Resource Access Project (RAP) network, a system to facilitate the delivery of handicap services in Head Start programs. The five priority tasks of the 15 regional RAPs for this time period were: (1) Provide technical assistance, services, and materials to Head Start grantees; (2) Conduct state training workshops; (3) Facilitate collaborative agreements; (4) Actively participate in RAP task forces; and (5) Maintain the computerized management information system. Details of RAP activities are provided for each of these five major project tasks. Activities on other RAP tasks are briefly summarized. Directions the network should take in the future are proposed. Recommendations are given for the management information system, the plan of work, conferences, initiatives, the RAP census, and task forces. Appendixes provide profiles of each of the 15 RAPs (including background, location, regional situation, operations, mainstreaming training conferences, short-term conference evaluation, resource providers, management information system, and telephone survey results); and summaries of impressions of the state education agencies working with each of the RAPs. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An Impact Evaluation of the Resource Access Projects 1983-1984

HHS-105-82-0008

ROY LITTLEJOHN ASSOCIATES, INC

1015 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-1388

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 212112

An Impact Evaluation of the Resource Access Projects 1983-1984

HHS-105-82-0008

Prepared By:

Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc.
1120 G Street, N.W.
Suite 801
Washington, D.C. 20005

December 1984

Authors

Judith V. Empson
Project Director

Janice L. Idyll
Co-Director

Lee Clark Gruber
Assistant Project Director

Marcia McGrath
Field Analyst

Richard Ellis
Data Analyst

Administration for Children, Youth and Families

Dr. Bernard Brown
RAP Evaluation Project Officer

Ms. Jane DeWeerd
RAP Program Officer

Ms. LaSandra Boone-Brown
RAP Evaluation Contracting Officer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The RAP evaluation staff acknowledge the contributions of many individuals to the evaluation effort throughout the year and to the preparation of this report.

We thank Dr. Bernard Brown, the RAP evaluationn project officer, for his assistance throughout the project, and Ms. Jane DeWeerd, the project officer for the RAP network, for her efforts on behalf of the evaluation. We also thank Ms. Barbara Bates for her careful review of this document.

The impact report has relied on information from hundreds of individuals at Head Start programs and State Education Agencies. Their perceptions of RAPs' services have enabled our staff to corroborate findings, document successes and identify areas for improvement.

For the eighth year RAP project staff have contributed generously of their time and perspetive to the evaluation effort, particularly during our on-site interviews and file research.

Finally, the project staff thanks Louise DuRant for her conscientious and successful application of computer skills through the data entry and production of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background on RAPs	1
	The Management Support Process	5
2.	RAP BUDGETS	7
	Annual RAP Program Budget Changes	7
	The "Typical" RAP	9
	Analysis of RAP Budget Line Items, 1983-84	11
	Total Budgets	11
	Salaries and Staff	11
	Indirect Costs	13
	Travel	14
	Computer Costs	14
	Other Direct Costs	14
3.	RAP TASKS: DETAILED ANALYSES OF RAP RESPONSES TO FIVE MAJOR PROJECT TASKS	17
A.	Provide Technical Assistance, Services and Materials to Head Start Grantees....[and] Encourage Grantees to Enroll Severely Handicapped Children	17
	Chief Needs for Handicap Services	18
	"Other" RAP Training	18
	Serving Children with Severe Handicapping Conditions	21
	Making RAP Services More Appropriate	23
	Assessing Services to Grantees: The Head Start Telephone Survey	24
	Familiarity with RAPs, Reaching Contact Persons, General Satisfaction	26
	Types of Contacts between Head Starts and RAPs	28
	Head Start Teaching Staff Reached by Mainstreaming Conferences	33
	Head Start Perceptions of Valuable RAP Services	33
	Problems	36
	Summary	36
B.	Conduct State Training Workshops	36
	Estimating the Level of Participation	38
	Grantees Attending Mainstreaming Training	43
	Teachers Trained	43
	Others Trained	43
	Strategies for Delivering Mainstreaming Training	44
	Broadening the Target Population	44
	Training Approaches Not Previously Used by Individual RAPs	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS cont

		Page
	Selection of Presenters	45
	Conference Design and Logistics	45
	Conference Problems	46
	Target Groups Other Than Teaching Staff	46
	Training Practices to Share with Other RAPs	47
	Participant Assessments of the Mainstreaming Conferences	48
	Background of Trainees	50
	What Trainees Liked Best	53
	Overall Satisfaction	54
	Workshop Topics	55
	Changes Resulting from the Training	61
	"Unexpected Conditions" and Other Problems	61
	Suggestions for Next Year	66
	Summary	66
C.	Facilitate Collaborative Agreements	67
	Collaboration with State Education Agencies	67
	SEA Sample Size	67
	Nature of Contacts	69
	Frequency of Contact	76
	Initiation of Contact	76
	Most Valuable Service	77
	Satisfaction with RAPs' Services	77
	Problems	78
	Suggestions	79
	Case Studies of Interactions Between SEA and Head Start	79
	Case Study #1	79
	Case Study #2	80
	Case Study #3	81
	Collaboration with Local Education Agencies	83
	Collaboration with Other Agencies Serving Children with Handicaps	83
D.	Actively Participate in RAP Task Forces	86
	Task Force on Language Development	87
	Task Force on Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, Track I	87
	Task Force on Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, Track II	88

TABLE OF CONTENTS cont

Page

Task Force on the Revision of TN 73.4..... 89
Task Force on the Examination of the Diagnostic Criteria..... 90
Task Force on the Development of a Film on Spina Bifida..... 90
Task Force on Regional Office/RAP Coordination..... 90
Problems..... 91
Observations..... 92

E. Maintain the RAPPLE Management Information System..... 93
Status of RAPPLE Implementation of Events..... 93
Resources..... 93
Resource Providers..... 93
Benefits of the Computer..... 94
Problems..... 94

4. OTHER RAP TASKS..... 97

Plan of Work..... 97
Maintain an Updated File of Resource Providers..... 98
Advisory Committees..... 98
Establish Contact with Directors..... 99
National RAP Meetings..... 100
Assist Head Start Grantees with the Annual Survey of Handicapped Children in Head Start..... 101

5. FUTURE DIRECTIONS..... 103

6. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 107

Findings..... 107
Recommendations..... 110

APPENDIX A: The RAP Profiles..... 113

The New England RAP..... 115
The New York University RAP..... 118
The Region III RAP..... 121
The Chapel Hill RAP..... 124
The Nashville RAP..... 127
The Mississippi RAP..... 130
The Illinois RAP..... 133
The Portage Project RAP..... 136
The Texas Tech RAP..... 139
The Region VII RAP..... 142
The Denver University RAP..... 145
The Los Angeles RAP..... 148
The Pacific RAP..... 151
The Portland State University RAP..... 154
The Alaska RAP..... 157

TABLE OF CONTENTS cont

Page

APPENDIX B: SEA Impressions of the RAP Network: Individual RAP Summaries..... 161

New England RAP..... 163
New York University RAP..... 165
Region III RAP..... 167
Chapel Hill RAP..... 169
Nashville RAP..... 171
Mississippi RAP..... 172
University of Illinois RAP..... 173
Portage Project RAP..... 175
Texas Tech RAP..... 177
Region VII RAP..... 179
Denver RAP..... 181
Los Angeles RAP..... 183
Pacific RAP..... 184
Portland State University RAP..... 186
Alaska RAP..... 188

TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	RAP Sponsors and Locations	3
Table 1.2	Characteristics of Individual RAP Service Areas	4
Table 2.1	Total Program Budgets, FY'77-'84	8
Table 2.2	RAP Project Budgets, 1983-1984	10
Table 2.3	Comparison of Average Total RAP Budgets and Selected Line Items	12
Table 3.1	Recipients of RAP Training Sessions (Other Than Mainstreaming)	19
Table 3.2	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects: 1983-1984	27
Table 3.3	Comparison of RAP Satisfaction Scores, 1980-1984	29
Table 3.4	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects: 1983-1984	30
Table 3.5	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects: 1983-1984	34
Table 3.6	Comparison of Selected Head Start Responses, 1980-1984	37
Table 3.7	Particpation in RAP Mainstreaming Conferences, 1983-1984	39
Table 3.8	Staff Trained by RAPs at Mainstreaming Conferences, 1979-1984	40
Table 3.9	Number of State Training Conferences and Training Participants	49
Table 3.10	Background on RAP Training Participants: Types of Trainees, By RAP	51
Table 3.11	Additional Background of Trainees: Work with Handicapped Children; Previous RAP Training	52
Table 3.12	Satisfaction with Mainstreaming Training, By RAP	53
Table 3.13	Workshop Topics Cited by Training Conference Participants, By RAP	57
Table 3.14	Topics Cited, Continued: Workshops Cited on Specific Handicaps, By RAP	60
Table 3.15	What Trainees Expect To Do Differently After Their Training, By RAP	62
Table 3.16	Unexpected Conditions that Affected the Training Conferences, By RAP	63
Table 3.17	Other Problems that Affected the Training Conferences, By RAP	64
Table 3.18	Suggestions from Conference Participants for Next Year's RAP Mainstreaming Training	65

TABLES cont

		Page
Table 3.19	Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction, 1983-1984.....	68
Table 3.20	National Profile of RAP/SEA Interactions, 1981-1984.....	70
Table 3.21	Existing SEA/Head Start Agreements as Reported by RAPs, 1984.....	73
Table 3.22	Abbreviated Contents of SEA/Head Start Collaborative Agreements.....	75
Table 3.23	Other Agencies Collaborating with RAP.....	85

INTRODUCTION

Background on RAPs

"Head Start Is For The Handicapped, Too!" Conceived as a national program offering comprehensive services to disadvantaged preschool children, Head Start was destined to take a leading role in serving children with handicapping conditions. The 1972 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act made this commitment explicit, by mandating that 10 percent of Head Start enrollment opportunities were to be filled by handicapped children. In response, the Head Start program began systematic efforts to recruit, enroll, and serve children with handicapping conditions, and to report annually on these efforts. In 1976, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) took steps to strengthen this Head Start initiative by funding the Resource Access Project (RAP) network, a system to facilitate the delivery of handicap services in Head Starts. Today, 15 RAPs serve Head Start children, their families, and the staff working with these children in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories.

In Head Start, mainstreamed classrooms reverse the once common educational practice of separating handicapped children from non-handicapped. This practice has made it necessary for Head Start to provide all of its early childhood personnel with the skills needed to meet children's special needs. Individualized services to handicapped Head Start children have been coordinated with the comprehensive services made available to all Head Start children in each of four component areas -- education, parent involvement, mental health/health/nutrition, and social services. In scope and scale, the Head Start handicap effort is an unparalleled program initiative for young children with disabilities. According to the most recent statistics available,* Head Start is serving 54,904 preschoolers with handicapping conditions, or 11.92 percent of total Head Start enrollment.

The RAPs serve Head Start programs in accordance with 11 contractual tasks delineated by the ACYF. Within these guidelines, however, each RAP responds to the particular needs of its own service area. The RAP tasks are presented below as RAPs prioritized them in 1983-84.

- Provide technical assistance, services and materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training workshops
- Develop and implement a plan of work for the region
- Facilitate collaborative agreements
- Establish contact with Head Start directors (tie)
- Actively participate in RAP task forces (tie)

---

*Taken from the National Tables, Head Start Handicap Efforts Survey, Full Year 1982-'83.

- Actively participate in national RAP meetings
- Maintain an updated file of resource providers
- Maintain the RAPPLE MIS
- Establish Advisory Committee
- Assist Head Start grantees with the annual survey of handicapped children in Head Start

Assisting local Head Start programs to provide quality services for handicapped children involves the RAPs in a wide range of activities. RAPs conduct training, develop and disseminate materials, identify and make referrals to additional resources, and provide technical expertise in such areas as special education, Head Start policy, and interagency collaboration. As part of a family of programs supporting Project Head Start, the RAPs also work in concert with ACYF regional office personnel, state Head Start associations, and other providers of Head Start training and technical assistance in their areas. In recent years, RAPs have taken a lead in forging interagency agreements for Head Start with public and private agencies concerned with young handicapped children at state and local levels. Additional contract requirements relate to the operations of the RAP network itself. These include attending national RAP meetings, serving on task forces, conducting RAP advisory committee meetings, and implementing a computerized recordkeeping system. Detailed discussion of the RAPs' performance relative to each of these contracted tasks is found in subsequent sections of this report.

The RAP network has operated for eight years. Table 1.1 identifies the individual sponsors, locations, and service areas for the RAPs in 1983-84.

The goals set by the RAPs for this program year reflected their major contractual tasks. Objectives typically included improving the delivery of training, fostering interagency collaboration, facilitating the signing (or revising) of Head Start/State Education Agency (SEA) agreements, strengthening ties within the Head Start system, and maintaining personal contact with, and responsiveness to, the needs of area Head Start programs. Several RAPs concentrated on refining their needs assessment processes during 1983-84, which is a critical activity for any service-oriented project. Other RAP objectives reflected Head Start's goal to increase attention to children with severe handicaps, and a trend to increase the capabilities of local Head Start staff to be trainers for their own programs.

Table 1.2, Characteristics of RAP Service Areas, shows some factors which influence RAP operations: the number of Head Start grantees served, the number of teaching staff, the number of handicapped children, and the geographical size of the service areas. A hypothetical "average" RAP serves 73 grantees, 2,421 teaching staff, and 3,415 handicapped children, in an area about the size of the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho combined.

The Texas Tech University RAP is the most severely taxed in terms of sheer numbers. The NYU, Region III, Chapel Hill, University of Illinois, and Los Angeles RAPs also serve areas with larger than average numbers of staff and handicapped children.

Table 1.1

RAP Sponsors and Locations

DHHS REGION	STATES	RAP SPONSOR
I	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	New England RAP Education Development Center Newton, Massachusetts
II	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	NYU RAP New York University New York, New York
III	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia	Region III RAP Georgetown University Washington, D.C.
IV	Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina	Chapel Hill RAP Chapel Hill Outreach Project Carrboro School District Chapel Hill, North Carolina
	Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee	Nashville RAP The Urban Observatory Peabody College of Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee
	Mississippi	Mississippi RAP Friends of Children of Mississippi Head Start Jackson, Mississippi (subcontracted through Chapel Hill Outreach Project)
V	Illinois, Indiana, Ohio	University of Illinois RAP University of Illinois Champaign, Illinois
	Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin	Portage RAP Portage Project CESA-5 Portage, Wisconsin
VI	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	Texas Tech University RAP Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas
VII	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska	Region VII RAP University of Kansas Medical Center Kansas City, Kansas
VIII	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming	University of Denver RAP University of Denver Denver, Colorado
IX	Arizona, California, Nevada	Los Angeles RAP Child, Youth and Family Services Los Angeles, California
	Hawaii, American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Marshall Islands, Palau, Ponape, Truk, Yap	Pacific RAP University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii
X	Idaho, Oregon, Washington	PSU RAP Portland State University Portland, Oregon
	Alaska	Alaska RAP Easter Seal Society Anchorage, Alaska

Table 1.2

Characteristics of Individual RAP Service Areas

RAP	# Head Start Grantees[a]	# HS Teaching Staff[b]	# Handicapped Children[c]	Square Miles	FTE	FTE Per Grantees	FTE Per Teaching Staff	FTE Per HC Child
New England	74	1,500	2,485	67,000	3.2	23	469	777
NYU	82	4,384	5,370	61,000	3.3	25	1,328	1,627
Region III	119	3,145	5,088	123,000	3.4	35	925	1,496
Chapel Hill	117	3,691	4,739	191,000	3.9	30	946	1,215
Nashville	84	2,851	3,694	132,000	4.1	20	695	901
Mississippi	23	2,894	3,221	48,000	3.8	6	762	848
Univ. of Ill.	115	3,582	6,772	132,000	5.0	23	716	1,354
Portage	85	2,454	3,760	190,000	4.8	18	511	783
Texas Tech	147	4,398	5,895	561,000	2.3	64	1,912	2,563
Region VII	67	1,230	2,722	285,000	4.1	16	300	664
Univ. of Denver	56	895	1,458	574,000	2.8	20	320	521
Los Angeles	56	3,949	4,218	383,000	3.0	19	1,316	1,406
Pacific	13	452	231	7,300	4.3	3	105	54
PSU	50	765	1,473	249,000	2.6	19	294	567
Alaska	3	121	97	586,000	2.1	1	58	46
Average	73	2,421	3,415	239,000	3.5	21	710	988

[a]Exclusive of IMPD Head Start programs, inclusive of Summer Head Starts and Parent Child Centers.

[b]Figures taken from interviews with RAPs, Spring 1984.

[c]Figures taken from National Tables 1982-1983, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (excludes IMPD programs).

Characteristics of the service areas of the Pacific and Alaska RAPs stand in sharp contrast to the others. These two RAPs serve much smaller numbers of grantees and children, but must cope with special difficulties of travel and communications, posed by distances and the remoteness of grantees, the scarcity of resources in outlying areas, and the multicultural populations which are served.

The relative burden on the RAPs can also be assessed on the basis of full-time equivalent staff (FTE) (column six of Table 1.2). The average FTE staffing for RAPs is 3.5, although it ranges from 2.1 to 5.0. The University of Illinois, Portage and Pacific RAPs have FTEs at the high end of the range, while the Texas Tech University, University of Denver, Portland State University, and Alaska RAPs have the lowest manpower levels. The last three columns of Table 1.2 show the numbers of grantees, teaching staff, and handicapped children served per RAP staff member, that is, how the project-level burden is mediated by FTE. While a high FTE at the University of Illinois RAP makes a large service population more manageable (i.e., closer to the average burden on RAP staff), a low FTE exacerbates the burden of service for the Texas Tech University RAP staff. The Head Start programs in Region IV (served by the Chapel Hill, Nashville, and Mississippi RAPs) have the additional support of a network of Specially Funded Coordinators (SFCs) which the Regional Office has funded specifically to assist the region's handicap effort. Similarly, Region VI funds 32 handicap consortia and six state handicap resource development coordinators to enhance the handicap effort in that area, which is served by the Texas Tech University RAP.

The Management Support Process

Annual assessments of RAPs' performance have served a dual purpose. They provide accountability for ACYF and management support for the RAP network. This third-party assessment presents findings to ACYF regarding RAP performance on the 11 contractual tasks, during the period from July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984.

The report summarizes findings from on-site visits, telephone surveys, and written assessments of RAP training. The information is used by ACYF to appraise program strengths and weaknesses and to note trends affecting services. For the RAPs, this report provides a review of the efforts of the network as a whole. Quantitative assessment is minimized. The process is formative by design; it seeks to describe trends, approaches, problems, and the unique aspects of individual RAPs, more than to make summary judgments on individual projects. Subsequent chapters of the report contain information on Budget and Staffing, RAP Tasks, Future Directions, and Findings and Recommendations. RAP profiles in Appendix A present a thumbnail sketch of each RAP's performance in key areas; Appendix B contains summaries of interviews with SEAs in each RAP's service area.

Data collection consisted of on-site interviews with RAP personnel, reviews of each project's files, and telephone surveys with 288 local Head Start staff and 59 SEA representatives. In addition, data on the effectiveness of RAP mainstreaming training were tabulated from 1,593 confidential assessment forms received by RLA from RAP trainees nationwide. These data combine RAP perceptions with the perceptions reported by those for and with whom RAPs work, i.e., local Head Start personnel and representatives of state education agencies. The RLA team consisted of four experienced analysts plus the support of a fifth individual who assisted with data tabulation, analysis, and editing. All evaluation staff have many years of experience with Head Start and the RAP program.

Five instruments were used to collect data. The principal source of information was a guide that evaluators used to conduct day-long interviews with staff at each of the RAP sites. This interview guide addressed major areas of program operations: goals,

budget and staffing, training, regional plan of work, services provided to grantees, collaboration, contact with Head Start directors, resource provider files, task force participation, MIS, RAP meetings, accomplishments, and recommendations.

A separate form was used to record the number and types of RAP training and technical assistance activities conducted between July 1, 1983 and March 31, 1984. It enabled a tally of the requestors, their geographic locations, providers, and the content of requests for each RAP. Information from RAP task records was also compiled.

Two questionnaires were used to conduct the telephone surveys with the Head Start and the SEA respondents. For each group, information was obtained about the frequency, nature, and satisfaction of their contacts with RAPs, as well as about problems, recommendations, and the RAP service considered most valuable.

Each RAP was asked to distribute a training assessment form to participants at two of their conferences. Participants' completed forms were mailed to RLA to be tallied.

RAP site visits were conducted by members of the management support team between April and early June. The review of the RAPs' files was conducted at RLA offices rather than on-site, an innovation made possible by the RAPs' use of a computerized recordkeeping system. The Head Start telephone survey began in March and continued through May. The SEA telephone survey was conducted in June.

2.

RAP BUDGETS

In this chapter a brief budgetary history of the RAP program will be discussed. The budget is then viewed from the perspective of the "average" or "typical" RAP project, and examined for what it buys, given the variations which exist among the catchment areas of the network. Finally, an analysis of selected 1983-84 budget line items is presented.

The RAP program budget totaled $2 531,500 for the 1983-84 program year. The RAP budgets are depicted in Table 2.1, Total Program Budgets, FY'77-'84. Increases over the years have sustained the original projects and added new contractors serving Mississippi, Alaska, and Hawaii and the Pacific. New initiatives have included the introduction and expansion of an automated recordkeeping system; collaboration with public agencies serving handicapped children; and a greatly expanded training effort in which between 11,000 and 15,000 participants a year, mostly Head Start teaching staff, receive a thorough orientation to the concepts of mainstreaming young handicapped children.

Annual RAP Program Budget Changes

The RAP program began in FY'77. The first budget supported 12 regional projects and staff were usually part time. A thirteenth RAP was funded to serve Indian and Migrant (IMPD) Head Start programs throughout the country.

In FY'78, the Mississippi and Alaska RAPs were added to the network, while the RAP which served IMPD Head Start programs was terminated. The FY'78 budget enlarged travel allotments, which had been substantially underfunded in the first year. Also, a new program initiative, promoting formal collaborative agreements between State Education Agencies and Head Start programs, was introduced into the scope of work.

The program budget in FY'79 rose by 38.6 percent over FY'78. The network was expanded to its present size, to include a RAP located in Hawaii to serve Head Start grantees in the Pacific; Texas Tech was introduced to the network, replacing the previous contractor for Region VI. Two new initiatives were introduced: a massive training effort to orient Head Start teachers to the concepts of mainstreaming children with handicaps, and a pilot computerized management and information system for the entire network. The FY'79 budget supported more full-time project staff, permitting the RAP projects to reduce their need for staff supported by other grants obtained by their sponsoring agencies.

For FY'80, the budget increased by 9.7 percent. The computerized management and information system was expanded to all continental RAPs, salary levels were increased, and travel costs rose commensurate with inflation. Some other costs decreased. The RAP at Georgetown University replaced the previous contractor for Region III.

The FY'81 program budget rose 20.7 percent over the previous year. The major program initiative was the revitalization of the network's management information system. Two contractors, Portland State University and the University of Denver, each with higher fringe and overhead rates, replaced two RAPs funded in previous years. All but one of the RAP contracts were signed with options for FY'82 and '83.

Table 2.1
Total Program Budgets
FY'77-'84

Line Items	FY'77	FY'78	FY'79	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	FY'83	FY'84
Salaries	$ 460,257	$ 557,592	$ 729,461	$ 741,386	$ 845,854	$ 947,743	$1,050,589	$1,100,299
Travel	74,386	120,656	172,204	185,236	247,689	257,780	251,763	283,372
Computer	N/A	N/A	44,322	119,529	138,100	160,332	160,204	146,187
Other Costs	198,254	127,748	237,359	229,117	234,188	256,415	274,340	301,286
Overhead & Fringe	144,994	245,711	274,186	323,852	464,536	518,850	580,499	700,355
Total Budget	$ 877,891	$ 1,051,707	$ 1,457,732	$ 1,599,120	$1,930,367	$2,141,126	$2,317,395	$2,531,500

The government picked up its option for FY'82 at costs which had been submitted and negotiated previously. The total program budget rose by 10.9 percent over the previous year, and the tasks and programmatic initiatives were unchanged.

In FY'83, costs were contained again by means of the contract options. New monies amounted to an 8.2 percent increase over the previous year.

New funds in FY'84 amounted to $214,105, or a 9.8 percent increase over FY'83. This is the first year where new budgets were negotiated after being locked into a three year commitment. Fifty-six percent of new money went for indirect costs (overhead and fringe), which are calculated on direct salary costs. Salaries accounted for 23 percent of new money, with the average salary increasing to $21,556, an 8 9 percent increase over the previous years' $19,785. However, the average complement of staff per project declined by the equivalent of .4 FTE (full-time equivalent) person. Travel costs increased by 12.5 percent and "other" costs (telephone, postage, reproduction, etc.) rose 13 percent. Computer costs decreased, by 8.7 percent.

The "Typical" RAP

The variations among individual RAP budgets can be seen in Table 2.2, RAP Project Budgets, 1983-1984. They range from a low of $144,655 at the University of Illinois RAP to a high of $199,741 at the Region III RAP. Differences exist within the budget line items because RAPs differ in their needs for staff, travel, telephone and other expenses, due to variations in geography, population density, and needs in their service areas. The introduction to this report identifies some of the regional factors which place varying demands on RAP budgets. To summarize briefly, RAPs have wide-ranging numbers of Head Start grantees to serve and large variations in the size of the populations of handicapped children. Additionally, the geographic size of the regions served by RAPs affects the relative amounts of the travel budgets. Furthermore, some RAPs serve diverse cultural populations or must adapt to particular state or regional service systems.

To facilitate comparisons of these budgets, we have constructed a hypothetical "typical" budget and service area, based on average figures for RAPs in each program year. The "average RAP" serves 73 Head Start programs that enroll 3,415 handicapped children in a catchment area of four states. This hypothetical RAP has a budget of $168,767, distributed as follows:

Direct Salaries		$ 73,353
Fringe Benefits, @ 19.2% of Direct Salaries		14,118
Overhead @ 44.4% of Direct Salaries		32,572
Travel		18,891
Computer		9,746
Other Costs		
Materials/Equipment/Supplies/ Conference Costs	4,484	
Reproduction/Printing	2,269	
Space Rental	2,249	
Communications	4,583	
Consultants, Contracted Services	6,502	20,087
Total		$168,767

The salary line for this average RAP would support 3.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) personnel; one of these would be a full-time coordinator and one would be a full time secretary or administrative assistant. A part-time person is apt to direct the

Table 2.2

RAP Project Budgets, 1983-1984

Region	RAP	Total Budget	Selected Budget Line Items					OH & Fr as % of Sal.	Staff	
			Salaries	Travel	Other Costs	Computer	Overhead & Fringe		FTE	Sal/FTE
I	New England	$ 177,182	$ 73,766	$ 11,744	$ 17,880	$ 10,800	$ 62,992	85.3 %	3.2	$ 23,052
II	NYU	190,501	80,821	11,705	13,250	7,181	77,544	95.9	3.3	24,491
III	Region III.	199,741	78,867	13,270	13,198	5,590	88,816	112.6	3.4	23,196
IV	Chapel Hill	168,332	73,829	26,234	19,100	10,400	38,769	52.5	3.9	18,931
	Nashville	165,516	70,800	25,766	14,540	10,800	43,610	61.5	4.1	17,268
	Mississippi	149,758	69,134	18,190	19,339	10,800	32,295	46.7	3.8	18,193
V	U of Ill.	144,655	79,018	15,779	21,807	8,565	19,486	24.6	5.0	15,804
	Portage	173,026	92,984	24,398	22,900	8,516	24,228	26.0	4.8	19,372
VI	Texas Tech	148,940	55,497	20,727	36,722	10,800	25,194	45.3	2.3	24,129
VII	Region VII	149,523	80,344	18,486	13,950	10,680	26,063	32.4	4.1	19,596
VIII	U of Denver	168,183	58,478	22,500	8,000	10,800	68,405	116.9	2.8	20,885
IX	Los Angeles	183,800	82,678	21,233	21,100	8,575	50,213	60.7	3.0	27,559
	Pacific	186,830	87,987	28,929	17,300	7,705	44,909	51.0	4.3	20,462
X	PSU	165,143	53,235	13,911	23,400	10,800	63,797	119.8	2.6	20,475
	Alaska	160,370	62,861	10,500	38,800	14,175	34,034	54.1	2.1	29,934
TOTAL		$2,531,500	$1,100,299	$283,372	$301,286	$146,187	$ 700,355	985.3 %	52.7	$323,347
AVERAGE		168,767	73,353	18,891	20,086	9,746	46,690	65.6	3.5	21,556

project, and the remaining staff would be resource or training specialists. All professional staff would be likely to have formal schooling in special education, and experience either as a trainer, or with Head Start, or both. The average FTE salary for the staff is $21,556, as noted earlier.

Overhead calculations follow a variety of formulae in cost proposals. For comparative purposes, we define overhead as a percentage of total direct salaries, reflecting widespread contract practices and federal agency conventions. Fringe benefits are treated as a part of this overhead. For the "Average RAP," the multiplier is 66 percent.

Other Costs. Travel costs for the typical RAP include in-region travel for staff, advisory committee members, and consultants, and costs for attending national RAP meetings. Communication costs incorporate both telephone and postage. Materials, equipment, and supplies include purchase of resource library materials, rental of office machinery, office supplies, computer repairs, and expenses related to conducting conferences. This year nine RAPs specifically identified conference-related costs, which included conference room and equipment rentals, supplies and materials, and communication costs, with amounts ranging from $400 at the Pacific RAP to $4,000 at the NYU RAP. The average conference costs were $1,115 for these nine RAPs. Reproduction and printing apply to distributed media, i.e., brochures, films, slide presentations, pamphlets, or other duplicated documents. Consultants and contract services usually entail purchased expertise for workshop presentations, but also include bookkeeping services, janitorial services, and graphics. Table 2.3 compares costs at the "typical" RAP from FY'77 to FY'84.

Analysis of RAP Budget Line Items, 1983-84

Total Budgets:

- Budgets increased at fourteen RAPs; the Pacific RAP budget decreased by 14.7 percent.

- Increases in budgets ranged from lows of 1.2 percent at the Los Angeles RAP and 1.9 percent at the Denver RAP, to highs of 33.5 percent at the Region III RAP and 24.3 percent at both the New England and Nashville RAPs. The average increase was 12.1 percent. Four other RAPs had increases greater than 10 percent -- Mississippi (18.3), PSU (14.3), Chapel Hill (12.8), and Portage (12.0). The remaining RAPs fall between 4.3 percent and 7.8 percent.

- Overall allocations of funds into budget categories are like those of the two previous years: salary (43 percent of budget); overhead and fringe (28 percent); other costs (11 percent); travel (11 percent); and computer (6 percent).

Salaries and Staff:

- The program budget for salaries totaled $1,100,299, an increase of 4.7 percent over the previous year, accounting for 23 percent of new money. Increases in salary lines generally supported salary raises rather than additional staff.

Table 2.3

Comparison of Average Total RAP Budgets and Selected Line Items
FY'77 - FY'78

Budget Items	FY'77	FY'78	FY'79	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	FY'83	FY'84
Total Budget	$ 67,530	$ 75,122	$ 97,169	$106,608	$ 128,691	$ 142,741	$154,493	$168,767
Salaries	35,404	39,828	48,640	49,426	56,390	63,183	70,039	73,353
Travel	5,722	8,618	11,480	12,349	16,513	17,186	16,785	18,891
Other Costs	15,250[a]	9,152	15,824	15,274	15,612	17,094	18,289	20,086
Computer Costs	-	-	2,955	7,969	9,207	10,689	10,680	9,746
Overhead/Fringe	11,153	17,551	18,279	21,591	30,969	34,589	38,700	46,690
Overhead/Fringe as a Percentage of Salaries	32.0%[a]	44.0%	28.0%	44.0%	58.0%	54.7%	55.3%	65.6%
FTE[b]	2.90	2.97	3.48	3.15	3.31	3.42	3.50	3.51
Salaries/pd. FTE	11,881	13,640	14,634	15,691	17,665	18,873	19,785	21,556

[a]Fringe treated as other costs for 1976-77

[b]Donated personnel deducted from FTE totals

- The salary line decreased at four RAPs -- Texas Tech (by 16.2%), Alaska (11.6%), Denver (1.5%) and Pacific (1.1%). All other RAPs increased, ranging from lows at Mississippi (by 4.1%) and Region VII (4.5%), to a high at PSU (23%). The remaining RAPs had increases in salaries ranging between 5.4 percent and 17.2 percent. The average salary increased 9.8 percent for the eleven RAPs with increases in the salary line.

- For the network as a whole, the average salary increased 8.9 percent over the previous year, to $21,556 (including both professional and support personnel). Salaries were lowest at Illinois and Nashville, and highest at Alaska and Los Angeles.

- The network saw a small decrease in total FTE staff effort, from 53.1 to 52.7 overall. Staffing levels remained fixed at two RAPs, increased (by less than one FTE person) at seven RAPs, and decreased (by less than one) at six RAPs. The average FTE staffing level for the network remained the same as the previous year, 3.5. Only Portland, Alaska, Denver, and Texas Tech had FTE staffs of less than three persons; the first two contractors drew heavily on the supplementary services of consultants.

Indirect Costs:

- Indirect costs, i.e., charges for fringe and overhead, totaled $700,355, an increase of 20.6 percent over last year.

- Indirect costs constitute just over one-quarter (28%) of the total program budget.

- Allocations for indirect costs averaged $46,690 per project, and ranged from a low of $19,486 at Illinois to highs of over $88,000 at Region III and over $77,000 at NYU.

- Indirect costs this year averaged 65.6 percent of salaries. Rates range from 24.6 to 119.8 percent of salaries. These variations are due at least in part to variations in RAP project locations. For example, the Portage RAP, which has always had relatively low indirect costs, is located in a small town in rural Wisconsin and is sponsored by a local educational services agency. Most other RAPs are in major urban areas, and their sponsors are more typically higher-overhead organizations like universities. Such variations have pronounced effects on expenses such as rent.

- Fringe benefits range from lows of 10 percent at Illinois and 10.2 percent at Nashville to highs of 35 percent at PSU and 33 percent at Pacific, with the average at 19.8 percent.

- Variations in overhead rates were extreme, ranging from $2,842 at Portage to $71,702 at Region III. Denver and NYU also have large allocations for overhead.

Travel:

- The travel allocation was $283,372 (a 12.5 percent increase over last year), accounting for 11 percent of the total budget (the same proportionate share of the total budget as last year). Two RAPs had almost identical travel budgets; four RAPs had lower travel budgets than in the previous year. The remaining RAPs had budget increases for travel, with Los Angeles and Nashville seeing the greatest increases.

- There is a rough correlation between travel expenses and the geographic size of regions. RAPs with smaller areas to serve (e.g., New England and NYU) had lower allocations for travel. Those with larger areas and travel distances, like Denver and Pacific, had commensurate budgets.

Computer Costs:

- Funding for computer costs decreased 8.7 percent from last year. A total of $146,187, or 6 percent of the total program budget, supported the computerized network. Each RAP allocated $5,040 for the system support management contract, located at the New England RAP.

Other Direct Costs:

- Other direct costs include all remaining out-of-pocket charges for communications (telephone and postage), equipment, supplies, printing and reproduction, materials, consultants, contracted services (design work, custodial services, bookkeeping, etc.), space rental and expenses related to conferences. Costs for these items varied at each RAP.

- RAPs differ widely in their budgeting practices for other costs, which range from $8,000 at Denver and $9,250 at NYU to $38,800 at Alaska. All RAPs allow for telephone costs, but the estimates range from $1,000 at Denver to $7,500 at Los Angeles. All RAPs show separate allocations for supplies, equipment, and (with the exception of NYU) reproduction. Nine RAPs have budgets for library materials; the others have none.

- All RAPs budget for consultants, usually to provide expert presentations at training conferences. The PSU and Alaska RAPs use consultants extensively to supplement staff for on-site services; their budgets for consultant services exceeded $15,000, while the average line item was approximately $6,500. The Region VII RAP had the smallest consultant budget, $1,500.

We have described the organization, nature, and service tasks of the RAP program, and have summarized the funding resources allocated to the RAPs to enable them to carry out the work of assisting Head Starts in serving handicapped children in a wide variety of situations and locales. In the following chapters of this report, the performance of the RAPs is assessed for each of the major tasks that they are contracted to provide.

3.

RAP TASKS

DETAILED ANALYSES OF RAP RESPONSES TO FIVE MAJOR PROJECT TASKS

In this section of the management support report, an in-depth review is made of the ways that the RAPs have responded to five principal work tasks assigned to them in their agreements with ACYF:

- The basis of the RAP program is the provision of support to Head Starts in carrying out services for handicapped children. The first subsection below reviews the work of RAP projects in providing technical assistance, local training, materials, and other kinds of assistance to Head Starts. A sample survey of Head Start grantees provides data on the reactions of the local programs to these RAP services.

- A special emphasis of the RAP program has been a national effort to train Head Start staff in the techniques of mainstreaming handicapped children. The next subsection treats RAP mainstreaming training efforts in 1983-84, including the results of assessment questionnaires distributed to trainees at a sample of these conferences.

- Another special emphasis of the RAP program has been the encouragement of collaboration between the Head Start program and state and local education agencies (SEA's and LEA's). The third task subsection discusses what the RAPs have done in 1983-84 to facilitate collaboration, and includes results from a telephone survey of SEAs.

- RAP Task Forces and the program's RAPPLE information management system are two of the major tools used for the overall direction of RAP. These activities are treated in Tasks 4 and 5.

Additional tasks required of the RAPs by their contracts are discussed under Other Tasks including their work plans, RAP Network meetings, and advisory committees.

Provide Technical Assistance, Services and Materials to Head Start Grantees... [and] Encourage Grantees to Enroll ... Severely Handicapped Children

RAPs' primary responsibility is to support Head Start grantees as they recruit and serve handicapped children and their families. Supportive services may involve training or technical assistance, dissemination of materials, or sharing of information. RAPs ranked this task as having major importance. The first half of this section will focus on chief needs among Head Start grantees, training provided by RAPs (other than mainstreaming training, which is treated in detail later), RAPs' efforts to encourage grantees to serve more severely handicapped children, and how RAPs think their services might be made more appropriate. The second half discusses users' perceptions of the services received from RAP, based on findings from the Head Start telephone survey.

Chief Needs for Handicap Services

Previous RAP contracts had required RAPs to assess the needs of grantees in their service areas; this year the requirement was dropped. Nevertheless, all RAPs did conduct needs assessments, as they consider the process basic to designing their services.

When the RAPs were asked, "What are the chief needs for handicap services among the grantees RAP serves," working with parents emerged most frequently (seven RAPs); one of these specified work with delayed parents. Next most frequently mentioned were training on behavior management (five RAPs); training on recognizing and dealing with child abuse, and on primary prevention of child abuse (four RAPs); information about how to recruit and serve more severely handicapped children (three RAPs); and more training in general, or training on special education and early childhood development for handicap coordinators in particular (three RAPs). Three RAPs also reported that grantees continue to need training on writing and implementing IEP's, and another three indicated that grantees are in need of specialists to diagnose and treat handicapped children. No other needs were mentioned by more than one RAP.

"Other" RAP Training

Mainstreaming training conferences, discussed in detail in Task 2 below, are only one type of RAP training. RAPs conduct a great deal of training each year in addition to the mainstreaming conferences. Often these are responses to individual requests for on-site assistance from Head Start programs within regions; others are workshops designed for parts of or entire regions.

During 1983-84, RAPs conducted 239 training sessions beyond mainstreaming conferences, reaching 5,212 people, 3,360 of whom were Head Start teaching staff. Table 3.1, Recipients of RAP Training Sessions (Other than Mainstreaming), gives specific training data for each RAP. The highest numbers of sessions and trainees were at the Texas Tech RAP. Here RAP staff perceive their roles primarily as trainers, and use a regionally funded contract to augment their training capability in a massive service area. Other RAPs which conducted significantly more than the average number of "other" training sessions were Nashville, PSU, and Alaska. The lowest number of "other" training sessions was counted at the University of Denver RAP. Denver designs almost all of its training as mainstreaming training, and it is therefore counted elsewhere.

When data on mainstreaming conferences are included, some form of RAP training was provided to approximately 90 percent of the nation's 1,090 Head Start grantees. Three RAPs reached all of the grantees in their areas with some training (NYU, Los Angeles, and Alaska).

Many of these RAP training efforts focused on particular subjects, including:

- Interagency Collaboration/Team Building (NYU, Chapel Hill, University of Illinois, University of Denver, Los Angeles)
- "New Friends" (New England, Nashville, PSU, NYU, Alaska)
- TEACH Training (New England, NYU PSU)
- Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention (Region III, Portage)

Table 3.1
RECIPIENTS OF RAP TRAINING SESSIONS (OTHER THAN MAINSTREAMING)
1983-1984

RAP:	Number Training Sessions	Head Start Trainees:			Others	Total Number Trainees
		Teachers	Aides	Teaching Staff		
New England	15	93	39	132	205	337
New York University	12	14	9	23	369	392
Region III	20	415	178	593	328	921
Chapel Hill	18	0	0	0	1,172	1,172
Nashville	23	255	95	350	599	949
Mississippi	6	16	11	27	126	153
University of Illinois	3	11	0	11	49	60
Portage Project	19	174	93	267	599	866
Texas Tech	36	864	419	1,283	197	1,480
Region VII	10	35	22	57	70	127
Denver University	4	0	0	0	93	93
Los Angeles	11	63	58	121	109	230
Pacific	16	145	68	213	50	263
Portland State University	23	103	53	156	338	494
Alaska	23	70	57	127	154	281
All RAPs	239	2,258	1,102	3,360	4,458	7,818
Average	16	151	74	224	297	521

- Volunteers (Chapel Hill, Nashville)
- PIR Clinics (Texas Tech)
- Speech/Language (Alaska)
- PA26 (University of Denver, Pacific)
- Attitudes, Handicap Awareness (Nashville, Pacific)
- Head Start Diagnostic Criteria (NYU)
- Parent/Family Involvement (Nashville)
- DIAL Training (Pacific)
- Observation (Pacific)
- Developmental Therapy (PSU)

RAPs have frequently developed a training idea into whole workshops, or into replicable formats. Among training sessions created by RAPs in 1983-84 was Mississippi RAP's "Preparing and Adapting for Changes," which focused on the transitions that children, parents, and staff must make between Head Start and public schools, or during hospitalization. The NYU RAP's session for Special Needs Coordinators, "Utilization of Resources," introduced new materials that are available and also involved participants in scenarios which required them to use these materials. The Texas Tech University RAP offered three new training modules (known as "Skill Building Blocks"), on mainstreaming children with specific handicaps, concepts involved in mainstreaming, and volunteer grandparents in mainstreaming. Alaska RAP piloted its "Small Talk" language package in Head Start classrooms.

The University of Denver RAP trained Region VIII Regional Office personnel on mainstreaming, assessments, and IEPs. The Region III RAP held a regional workshop for home-based staff. The New England RAP held sessions for parents. Area directors in Region VII received training on the use of PA26 funds, writing job descriptions, and transitioning. The Portage Project RAP trained Head Start administrators on such management issues as how to delegate responsibility. At State Training Office (STATO) conferences, the PSU RAP presented sessions for education coordinators which compared early childhood special education and early childhood education. Both the University of Illinois and Los Angeles RAPs trained members of their areas' Head Start Associations.

Local handicap coordinators were a focal group for all RAPs. The Region III RAP held several workshops, including one for both handicap and education coordinators, on behavior management. Portage Project RAP training discussed "situational leadership." Training the-trainers was a major focus for Region VII training for handicap coordinators in each state. New handicap coordinators received orientation training from the Los Angeles RAP. The Texas Tech University RAP designed training for consortia coordinators as well as local coordinators.

RAPs also trained non-Head Start audiences. The Nashville RAP presented at the Kentucky Regional Teachers Conferences. The PSU RAP offered training at statewide Council for Exceptional Children Conferences (CEC) or Association for the Education of Young Children (AEYC) conferences in each of the states it serves. Region III conducted training for the staffs of two day care centers. Day care workers were also

the focus of the Alaska RAP's training at the Alaska AEYC Conference on adapting to change. Other non-Head Start groups which RAPs involved in training this year included the following:

- NYU RAP - Members of the Association for the Care of Children in Hospitals (ACCH), and INTERACT, an association of New Jersey providers;
- Region III RAP - Court-appointed advocates for mentally retarded adults;
- University of Denver RAP - Community college students (overview of Head Start's handicap effort); and
- Pacific RAP - Public Health personnel from Saipan who will be serving Head Start children.

Serving Children with Severe Handicapping Conditions

In FY'83, ACYF accelerated an initiative to serve more severely handicapped children in Head Start. Although there is some confusion in the field about the definition of "more severely handicapped," and ACYF has refrained from defining the term beyond such possible indicators as multiply handicapped and amount of special services needed, the FY'84 RAP RFP required projects to encourage grantees to enroll more of these children.

During evaluation site visits, RAPs were asked to discuss focused efforts they may have made to improve the capabilities of Head Starts serving severely handicapped children. The RAPs' principal approach to this task was to offer training on the subject. The New England and Los Angeles RAPs used it as a unifying theme for their mainstreaming conferences. Most RAPs scheduled specific workshops on severe handicapping conditions:

- Understanding Neuromuscular Problems (New England)
- Integrating the Autistic Child and Family into Head Start (NYU)
- Severely/Profoundly Handicapped Children (Region III)
- Health Impairments and Medical Terminology (Chapel Hill)
- Classroom Suggestions and Activities for Mainstreaming the Severely Handicapped Preschooler (Nashville)
- Emotional Disturbance (Mississippi)
- A Different Drummer: The Hearing Disabled Child (University of Illinois)
- Serving Severely or Multiply Impaired Preschoolers (Portage)
- Mainstreaming Preschoolers with Health Impairments (Texas Tech)
- Mainstreaming Children with Orthopedic Handicaps (Region VII)

- Serving Severely Handicapped Children, or "Monsters are Pretend" (University of Denver)

- Looking at Children with Severe Emotional Disturbance (Los Angeles)

- The Cerebral Palsied: Classroom and Home (Portland State University)

RAPs also perceived their role to include raising awareness of the needs of severely handicapped children, and used meetings with advisory committees, directors, and handicap coordinators to encourage programs to identify and recruit these children, reminding supervisory staff that RAP would make themselves available for technical assistance as programs mainstreamed these youngsters. RAPs had information to share on dual placements, and materials to lend to inform staff of the nature of these disorders and on intervention strategies.

Beyond supplying traditional training, technical assistance, materials, and information, several approaches taken by RAPs represented unique efforts to encourage Head Starts to serve more severely handicapped children:

- The New England RAP produced a research paper with a bibliography on serving severely handicapped children.

- The Alaska RAP developed a survey report on the number and location of children with severe handicapping conditions in Alaska, so training can be designed to address their needs.

- The Chapel Hill and Region VII RAPs developed media materials on self help skills and a task analysis for working with severely handicapped children; the University of Denver RAP developed a training manual on serving children with visual impairments.

- Chapel Hill issued a special edition of "Newsbreak" on serving severely handicapped children; this was also a regular emphasis in Region VII's "RAP Reach"; PSU disseminated similar information through special mailings.

- The Mississippi RAP developed contracts with agencies serving severely handicapped children, in order to facilitate referrals to Head Starts; the RAP also facilitated an agreement between Children's Medical Services and the state health department. The Mississippi RAP used its program profiles to identify children with severe handicaps, and made a special effort to get in touch with these families. When appropriate, the RAP also provided information about these children to public schools.

- The University of Illinois RAP asked about "new" types of handicapping conditions during canvass calls; University of Denver added a separate section in its needs assessments regarding severe handicapping conditions.

- The Region VII and PSU RAPs compiled lists of resources in each state which specifically serve severely handicapped children.

- Both the University of Denver and PSU RAPs went on-site to directly observe severely handicapped children and provide TA to teachers.

- The Los Angeles RAP scheduled discussions about interpretations of severe handicapping conditions at two conferences for supervisory staff.

Last, but not least, seven RAPs served on a task force in 1983-84 to explore innovative approaches to increasing the enrollment of severely handicapped children in Head Start. The task force drafted guidance to encourage grantees to enroll increased numbers of children with these special needs. The 1983-84 task force on revising TN 73.4, Services to the Handicapped, also added further emphasis to ACYF's directive by drafting the following proposed revision:

- programs must give consideration to the recruitment and enrollment of children from the full range of severity within a handicapping condition and no child can be denied enrollment because of the severity of his/her handicapping condition.

Making RAP Services More Appropriate

Over the RAP program's history, indexes of solid satisfaction with RAP services from three types of service recipients (Head Start grantees, SEAs, and trainees) have suggested that RAPs are meeting Head Start needs. This year evaluators asked RAPs directly whether they thought RAP services could be made more appropriate in any way.

Most responses were idiosyncratic to individual RAP service areas. The greatest consensus (seven RAPs) was that RAPs should go on-site to work with Head Starts. More funds for more staff would allow RAPs to provide hands-on technical assistance, thereby more directly affecting interventions with children, and would allow RAPs to provide demonstration training, orient a new handicap coordinator, or follow-up on mainstreaming training.

Three other suggestions were each mentioned by more than one RAP. Two RAPs expressed a need to work more closely with directors. A director's understanding of handicap training being offered, and his or her commitment to it, not only increases the likelihood that the director will earmark funds for attendance, but also be more likely to expect teachers to follow through in the classroom. Closely related were other suggestions that RAPs should design more training for trainers, and deemphasize direct training for teachers, and give increased attention to management tools and policy issues.

Second, two RAPs recommended that projects base their services on data collected from grantees (e.g., the PIR or pre- and post-training tests). Third, two RAPs felt the services they provide will become more appropriate when they increase the number of cluster trainings they can offer.

Other suggestions mentioned by individual RAPs were:

- Develop the resource and film library in order to lend more materials.

- Collaborate more closely with UAFs (University-affiliated facilities) and hospital-affiliated programs, in order to be more responsive to requests for service for specific children.

- Develop appropriate bilingual, bicultural assessment instruments.

- Integrate RAP services into the Regional Office's handicap effort.

- With expansion, be prepared to do more generic training of the type designed by the NYU RAP.

- Modify grantee needs assessment forms to include the handicap effort as a part of the larger whole.

- Get more input directly from teachers on training topics, not just from directors.

- Remain vigilant to misinterpretations of RAP services or expectations.

- Schedule two-part training, moving from group training to work with teachers in the individual classroom.

- Stay with concrete, practical applications, and not computers.

Assessing Services to Grantees: The Head Start Telephone Survey

Each year since the RAP program started, a sample of Head Start grantees has been surveyed to learn about their reactions to services they receive from the RAPs. The surveys are conducted by telephone and include inquiries about the types of service Head Starts are getting from RAP, what services are valued the most, and what problems have arisen. Compared with the information provided by the RAPs themselves on their services, such as the task records and other data summarized above, the user assessments provide a grantee's perspective on how well the RAP program is meeting the needs of its targeted clientele.

This year, a sample of 288 Head Starts was randomly selected from lists of all grantees in the areas served by each RAP. Compared to prior RAP evaluations, the sample size has been reduced by approximately 100 cases. The sample consisted of 21 Head Starts per RAP, except for the Alaska and Pacific RAPs (which serve less than 21 grantees in all, so all Head Starts served by those RAPs were selected), and for the New England RAP, where one case was lost in processing, reducing the size of the sample for that RAP to 20. It is our recollection that the lost form was a favorable case, meaning that results for New England are slightly biased against the RAP; this bias is taken unto account in comments made about this RAP, below. As in the past, very large Head Starts in New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. were treated as a separate strata, and were included whether drawn in the random sample or not.

Before reviewing the results, a brief discussion is in order on the effect of reduction in sample sizes on the data. Levels of effort for the Head Start telephone surveys were lowered by about 25 percent for 1983-84, as part of a general tightening of the evaluation design in response to budgetary stringencies. Only some RAPs were

affected, because RAPs vary widely in the number of grantees in their service districts, from only three in Alaska to 147 for Texas Tech.

- The Alaska and Pacific RAPs are not affected by the sample size reductions at all; both have less than 21 grantees and so the Head Start telephone surveys for these projects are based on 100 percent enumerations, as they have been in the past.

- With 23 grantees in its service area, 100 percent of Head Sarts served by the Mississippi RAP were sampled in past RAP phone surveys; the sample of 21 of the 23 grantees is almost as good as a total enumeration.

- Head Start telephone survey sampling ratios for all other RAPs range between one for every 2.38 grantees (for Portland) to one in every seven (at Texas Tech). There is very little difference among these RAPs in the precision of a sample based on 21 cases, despite these differences.*

Summarizing: the reduction in the size of the sample of Head Start grantees contacted for the RAP telephone survey does not affect results for Alaska, Pacific, or Mississippi. It leads to a small reduction in the precision of estimates for other RAPs--from a typical worst-case expectation of standard deviations in the plus-or-minus .09 range to deviations in the plus-or-minus .11 range. The effects on the data, then, are minimal. The results reflect standard statistical reasoning, which would predict that there should not be major differences in quality between randomly selected samples of size 30 and these of size 21. It should be noted, however, that further reductions in sample size would have much more drastic effects.

Most of the respondents to the survey are handicap coordinators. In some cases, more than one person had contact with the RAP; these were treated as composite cases, with interviews with both parties. A standard interview guide was used. It was slightly modified from that used in previous years, eliminating one item (whether contacts were initiated by the Head Start or by the RAP, an issue more critical in the earlier years of the program than it is now.)

---

*For example, if a normal distribution is assumed, the standard deviation of a population proportion of exactly .50 (a worst-case situation), based on a sample of 21 cases, is plus or minus .084 for cases where the sample is drawn from a total population of 50 cases. If the population size is tripled to 150 cases, the same size sample of 21 cases has a standard deviation of plus or minus .102. If the population size is infinite, the expected standard deviation is only plus or minus .109 if 21 cases are selected. This illustrates an elementary principle of sample statistics, that the size of the population from which a sample is selected has only minor influences on the precision of the results. All these other RAPs would have slight improvements in the precision of their estimates if the minimum sample size of 30 cases per RAP, used in past years, had been used. Stated in terms of the expected standard deviation of 50-50 proportion, the larger sample sizes improve precision of worst-case estimates by a factor of approximately .02 (the standard deviation for a sample of 30 cases drawn from a population of infinite size would be plus or minus .091, for example).

Familiarity with RAPs, Reaching Contact Persons, General Satisfaction

Familiarity with RAPs: Table 3.2, Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects, provides the number of cases sampled for each RAP, the proportion of those reached who had been identified as a "contact person" by the RAP, satisfaction with each RAP's work, and familiarity with the RAP. In last year's evaluation survey, all Head Start interviewees contacted for these purposes were familiar with their RAP projects. This year, five of the Head Starts in Texas Tech's area had to be prompted before they recognized the program. All other Head Starts contacted for the survey were familiar with RAP and did not require prompting to recognize it.

Reaching RAP Contact Persons: Participation in the Head Start telephone survey is voluntary. Each Head Start selected for the survey was contacted in advance by mail to explain the evaluation, describe the contents of the interviews, and request the program's cooperation. Both these letters and the subsequent interviews were addressed to persons whom RAPs had identified as most familiar with their work. Eighty-seven percent of the actual interviews were conducted with these "RAP contact persons." A notable shift from 1982-83 results took place for the Texas Tech RAP, where only 57 percent of the interviews could be conducted with the person identified as a "contact person" by the RAP. A certain amount of imprecision in the identity of these contacts is to be expected, if for no other reason than normal staff turnover in Head Starts. The level of uncertainty with the Texas Tech data considerably exceeds any encountered at other RAPs during the past two years, however. Site interviewers noted that Texas Tech makes a point of listing Head Start directors as the "principal contact," even though other Head Start staff may also interact with a RAP, so it is possible that this complication affects the results. Some contacts specified by the RAP had been recently replaced at the time of the calls, while others had been replaced as long as a year before.

Satisfaction with the work of the RAPs increased slightly from last year's high of 3.39 on 4.0 scale. This year's average score for all the sampled Head Starts is 3.48. As in the past, then, Head Starts continue to rate the work that RAPs do, overall, as "good" to "excellent."

The four-point satisfaction scale has been used as a single broad summary measure for these evaluations since 1976-77. A major appeal of the four-point system is that it is instantly intelligible to every party to the RAP system, because of its resemblence to the usual four-point grade average kept by most educational institutions. The lowest possible rating is 1.0 ("poor"). Scores of 2.0 are "fair," 3.0 is "good," 4.0 is "excellent." The respondents are invited to express their satisfaction by "grading" the RAP. In the Head Start telephone survey (but not in the mainstreaming conference assessments which use a similar measure), respondents may also award intermediate "grade point averages" like "3.25." They may decline to judge a RAP on any personal grounds (one person did so this year, saying that it didn't seem fair to judge the RAP without knowing how generously it was funded). In such an event, the case is excluded from computations of individual scores, so as not to unfairly penalize the RAP. (An exception to this rule is the score for the RAP network as a whole, which is based on all cases to facilitate comparability with survey data from earlier evaluation years). A distinction is made between such refusals and a responding Head Start's possible inability to offer a rating due to insufficient contact with the RAP; if the lack of contact is a problem with the RAP, and is not a byproduct of staff turnover or other reasonable actions at the Head Start, then such cases are automatically treated as scores of one, for "poor satisfaction."

TABLE 3.2: REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1983-1984
Number of cases, representation of main contacts, satisfaction, familiarity*

	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missis-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
Number of Head Starts Surveyed:	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	13	21	3	288
Proportion with main RAP contact as spokesperson:	0.75	0.90	0.90	0.86	0.86	0.95	0.81	0.81	0.57	0.90	0.95	1.00	0.92	0.95	1.00	0.87
Satisfaction: Average "Grade" (4.0 scale)**	3.39	3.69	3.51	3.57	3.48	3.72	3.45	3.67	3.22	3. 31	3.38	3.30	3.63	3.40	4.00	3.48
Familiarity with RAP:																
Yes--without prompts	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.76	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98
Yes--with prompting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
No	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total:***	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Notes: * Note that item for whether RAP or Head Start was the initiator of contact, asked in previous years, was not used this year.
** Four cases with little contact treated as one ratings; four other cases, either new staff or other "don't knows," were excluded.
*** Proportions based on the number of responding Head Starts.

For 1983-84, average satisfaction ratings for individual RAPs range from 4.0 for Alaska, which has only three grantees to serve, to 3.2 for Texas Tech. The coresponding range for scores was virtually identical in 1983-84, although there were shifts in scores for particular RAPs. Table 3.3, Comparisons of RAP Satisfaction Scores, 1980-1984, indicates how scores have increased and decreased over the past several years. RAPs with some slippage from 1982-83 to 1983-84 include Texas Tech, Region VII, and New England. The Region III RAP and the New York University RAP had moderate increases in this year's scores. Nashville and Portland State also experienced small increases in their ratings. Other RAP satisfaction scores are much the same as last year's.

Types of Contacts Between Head Starts and RAPs

Table 3.4 provides detailed statistics on the types of contact the Head Starts had with their RAPs. Overall, the local Head Starts mentioned an average of five different types of contact with RAP projects, a significant increase over the 1982-83 figure of 4.2 types of contact. In 1981-82, the same statistic was 4.6. Much of the variation in this statistic in recent years is due to changes in the numbers of reported "other" kinds of contact, a miscellaneous group of interactions between Head Starts and RAPs that is strongly influenced by the extent of new program initiatives in any particular year. This year, the number of these otherwise unclassified types of contact is up; a more detailed discussion is provided below.

The RAPs with the smallest numbers of grantees to serve (Alaska, Pacific, and Mississippi) have the largest numbers of different kinds of services reported by Head Starts, although the NYU RAP comes close to these levels. Alaska's three grantees report the greatest variety of contacts, as in the past, citing over 11 types of interactions on the average. Head Starts served by the Mississippi, Pacific and New York University RAPs report around six types of contact. The Head Starts served by the other RAPs tend to report between four and five types of contacts, except for Texas Tech, where grantees cite only about three--mainstreaming conferences, other RAP training, and receipt of materials.

In the telephone survey, respondents are explicitly prompted to check Head Start participation in RAP mainstreaming training conferences as well as other training offered by RAP. All other types of contact are unprompted, although respondents are encouraged to recollect all contacts between their Head Start and RAP. Since 1980, mainstreaming training has been the most commonly cited type of contact between RAPs and the Head Starts they serve. Every Head Start we contacted had sent people to these conferences in the cases of the Mississippi and Alaska RAPs. Ninety percent or more of the Head Starts had participated in mainstreaming training conferences in the cases of the New England, NYU, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Denver, and Pacific RAPs. Only 52 percent of the Head Starts reported such contact with the Region III RAP; two-thirds reported these contacts with Texas Tech. All other RAPs reached at least three-quarters of the sampled Head Starts with their mainstreaming programs. These data are reviewed again in Task 2 below, to examine their consistency with other information on Head Start participation in RAP mainstreaming training.

Sixty-nine percent of all the Head Starts report receiving mass mailings, such as a survey on diagnostic criteria, from the RAPs. Three-fifths report receiving other materials; similar numbers report general information exchanges with a RAP. Typical materials provided by RAPs include lesson plans and other guides for classroom teachers, handouts for community awareness programs, and parent education materials. Information provided by RAPs can be as general as lists of screening instruments or as specific as diagnostic information for recognizing particular disabilities.

TABLE 3.3: COMPARISONS OF RAP SATISFACTION SCORES, 1980-1984

RAP*	Year: 1980:	1981:	1982:	1983:	1984:	Changes, 1983-84:
New England	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.4	-0.3
New York University	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.7	+0.2
Region III*	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.2	3.5	+0.3
Chapel Hill	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.6	-0.1
Nashville*	3.4	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.5	+0.2
Mississippi	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.7	-0.1
University of Illinois	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	None
Portage	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	+0.1
Texas Tech*	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	-0.3
Region VII	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.3	-0.2
University of Denver*	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.4	+0.1
Los Angeles	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3	None
Pacific*	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.6	None
Portland State Univ.	2.8	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.4	+0.2
Alaska*	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	None
Average for all RAPs	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.5	+0.1

* Changes in the makeup of the RAP network, since its inception in 1976, are as follows. In 1977-78, the Alaska RAP was added. In 1978-79, the Pacific RAP was added, and Texas Tech replaced the University of New Mexico as the RAP contractor for Region VI. In 1979-1980, Georgetown University replaced PUSH/RAP in Keyser, West Virginia as the contractor for Region III. In 1980-81, the University of Denver replaced the Mile High RAP as the contractor for Region VIII, and Portland State University replaced the University of Washington in Region X.

TABLE 3.4: REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1983-1984
Types of Contact with the RAPs

Types of Contact:	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missi-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
General:																
LEA Agreements	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.19	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.24	0.23	0.10	1.00	0.10
HS is a RAP resource	0.05	0.05	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.38	0.19	0.05	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.14	0.15	0.05	0.33	0.13
Dealt w/specific HC	0.00	0.33	0.19	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.14	0.33	0.11
Mass mailings, newsl.	0.85	0.52	0.62	0.95	0.67	0.62	0.81	0.90	0.33	0.90	0.62	0.81	0.23	0.57	1.00	0.69
Information Exchange	0.45	0.86	0.48	0.48	0.57	0.86	0.57	0.62	0.29	0.76	0.38	0.67	0.62	0.71	1.00	0.60
Materials	0.30	0.90	0.52	0.71	0.57	0.52	0.67	0.67	0.52	0.48	0.57	0.48	0.92	0.62	1.00	0.60
Meetings:																
RAP-sponsored	0.40	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.19	0.33	0.29	0.19	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.15
Not RAP-sponsored	0.10	0.29	0.24	0.19	0.33	0.24	0.19	0.19	0.33	0.19	0.05	0.33	0.38	0.19	1.00	0.24
Advisory Committees	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.54	0.05	1.00	0.06
T&TA:																
Training from the RAP	0.60	0.48	0.43	0.48	0.52	0.76	0.29	0.33	0.76	0.52	0.14	0.38	0.85	0.38	1.00	0.49
RAP arranged training	0.05	0.14	0.00	0.10	0.19	0.19	0.05	0.14	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.23	0.29	0.33	0.10
Tech/Assist from RAP	0.25	0.43	0.24	0.05	0.14	0.57	0.10	0.24	0.14	0.19	0.29	0.29	0.46	0.29	0.67	0.26
Mainstreaming Conf.	0.95	0.95	0.52	0.95	0.90	1.00	0.86	0.76	0.67	0.81	0.95	0.81	0.92	0.81	1.00	0.84
Other Types of Contact:	0.25	1.00	0.71	0.62	0.57	0.67	0.81	0.57	0.05	0.24	0.81	0.57	0.62	1.24	1.67	0.64
Average Number of Different types of contact reported by Head Starts:	4.50	6.14	4.33	4.95	4.81	6.33	5.00	4.90	3.38	4.43	4.05	4.90	6.31	5.48	11.33	5.00

Notes: Multiple responses. Two Head Starts reported no contact with their RAP (one for Nashville, one for Texas Tech).

Approximately half of the Head Starts mention other training, in addition to mainstreaming conferences, which had been provided by RAPs (49 percent) or arranged with assistance from a RAP (ten percent). Over three-quarters of the Head Starts in the areas served by the Alaska, Pacific, Mississippi, and Texas Tech RAPs cited this kind of training. Texas Tech is especially oriented to training (it has held Region VI contracts for Head Start training for many years). Some Head Starts in the region may receive as many as three to five on-site training sessions a year from either the RAP or the Texas Tech regional training staff. At the opposite pole, only a few of the Head Starts served by the University of Denver mention "other" kinds of training; as noted earlier, this RAP serves its very large region with on-site mainstreaming conferences, so almost all its training efforts are covered by those sessions.

The only other type of contact reported by majorities of the Head Starts was the miscellaneous "other" class. Most of the "other" kinds of contact reported by RAPs could be classified into one of three basic types: regular informal telephone contact with RAPs, as a means of simply keeping up with general developments in Head Start handicap service work; matters relating to the Head Start census of handicapped children; and matters relating to needs assessments. On a RAP-by-RAP basis:

- At New England, most "other" contacts involve the Head Start census.

- At the NYU RAP, many grantees note a general inclination to stay in close touch with the RAP by phone, "to stay in touch with what coordinators are doing." Some also mention contacts related to the Head Start census.

- At the Region III RAP, the grantees mention the Head Start census, needs assessments, and a number of miscellaneous contacts including supportive phone contact, follow-up on a letter sent by a parent to the White House, work on a State Education Agency agreement, and other matters.

- At Chapel Hill, grantees contact the RAP in connection with needs assessments; they also note indirect contacts through Region IV's Specially Funded Coordinators for handicapping services.

- At Nashville, many grantees talk with the RAP "all the time," "periodically," or "often," just to stay in touch. There are also a number of contacts related to needs assessments.

- At Mississippi, about half the "other" contacts are related to needs assessments; most of the rest are general phone contacts, apparently broadly supportive in nature; one Head Start also mentioned on-site work by the RAP in preparation for a training session.

- At the University of Illinois, many Head Starts note informal contact with the RAP over the phone. The census, needs assessments, and an assessment of topics for a conference were also mentioned.

- At Portage, grantees note regular, informal telephone contact to "keep up," and needs assessments.

- At Texas Tech, one respondent noted calls from the RAP twice a year "to see if anything was needed."

- At the Region VII RAP, grantees mention informal phone contacts and the survey (census) of handicapped children.

- At the University of Denver, most Head Starts mention needs assessment contacts, and many note informal contacts on the phone. One noted visiting the RAP office to look at screening and evaluation tools.

- At Los Angeles, the RAP keeps in touch with grantees with phone calls; the census of Head Start children has led to some contacts; one Head Start noted working with the RAP on a special education network presentation.

- At the Pacific RAP, grantees mention the RAP's leadership in working with the applicable SEA's. They also note a variety of other services and help obtained from the RAP.

- At Portland State University's RAP, the grantees mention needs assessments, general supportive phone contacts, and the Head Start census.

- At Alaska, grantees keep in close touch with RAP by phone "frequently" or "just to see what's up."

The stressing of the value of regular informal contacts is noteworthy and suggests the growing importance of the RAP network as a means for the national dissemination of innovations in the care of handicapped children. It is also consistent with contractual requirements for periodic contacts with Head Starts on the part of RAPs.

Other more specific types of RAP/Head Start interactions were reported by a quarter of the respondents or less:

- 24-26 percent mention contact with RAPs at non RAP-sponsored meetings (usually Head Start directors' meetings or regional Head Start meetings), and obtaining technical assistance through RAPs (for example, referral to expert providers of services for children with particular handicaps).

- 10-15 percent mention RAP involvement in working out agreements with local education agencies (grantees served by the New England, Mississippi, Los Angeles, and Pacific RAPs were most likely to cite this kind of contact); serving as a resource to RAP, such as hosting a RAP training conference, reviewing a new product, or being selected as a site for a RAP project like a film; working with the RAP on a problem involving a specific handicap (Alaska and NYU grantees were especially likely to mention this type of contact); or attending RAP-sponsored meetings, such as sessions for handicap coordinators sponsored by the New England, Illinois, and Portage RAPs.

On the whole, these distributions resemble those of past years. The lowest percentages are higher than they were in 1982-83 and receipt of RAP materials is up.

Head Start Teaching Staff Reached by Mainstreaming Conferences

The telephone survey included the collection of data on the numbers of teachers and teaching aides on the Head Start grantee's staff, and the numbers of these workers who attended RAP mainstreaming conferences. The overall proportion of teaching staff reached by the network's conferences is 30 percent, a five percent improvement from 1982-83. The increase was distributed over both teachers and aides. Data are provided in Table 3.5.

A number of specific RAPs contributed to this rise. The Alaska RAP, which reached 35 percent of the teaching staff in its region last year, reached 100 percent this year; the University of Illinois went from 56 percent of all teaching staff in '82-83 to 74 percent in '83-84; New England, from 31 percent to 47 percent; and Denver, from 45 to 59 percent. The Pacific RAP continued to reach very high portions of its targeted audience, over 70 percent in both years. The PSU RAP dropped its share slightly but in general it continued to reach half of the teaching staff in its region. The NYU, Nashville, and Los Angeles RAPs did not reach such generous shares of the possible target audience, but did increase their shares of teaching staff reached, compared to the previous year. Drops in this statistic were notable for Region VII, which reached 64 percent of its teaching staff last year, 27 percent this year; and for Texas Tech, which reached 26 percent in '82-83, 13 percent in '83-84. Region III and Chapel Hill also had low reported proportions of teaching staff reached by mainstreaming conferences, as in the previous year.

As in previous RAP evaluations, these sample survey-based estimates of Head Start teaching staff reached by mainstreaming training conferences do not always agree with other estimates based on data obtained from the RAPs. The telephone survey data was doublechecked with call-backs, and the survey data on participation in the conferences for the RAP network as a whole are virtually identical to those estimates based on completely independent data provided by the RAP network, although some discrepancies between the two estimates do appear for some particular RAPs. Additional comments are provided below in Task 2.

Head Start Perceptions of Valuable RAP Services

The most valued service provided by RAPs, as in the past, is training. Sixty-three percent of the Head Starts cite it. All other services trail far behind in significance. The next most frequently mentioned class, after training, is "others," another miscellaneous group described in detail below; a third of the grantees mentioned such services as valuable. A quarter of the Head Starts mentioned

TABLE 3.5 : REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1983-1984
Percent of teaching staff trained by RAPs, valued RAP services, problems

	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missis-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
Proportion of Teaching Personnel trained at RAP Mainstreaming Training Conferences:																
Teachers:	0.54	0.30	0.23	0.18	0.33	0.29	0.75	0.27	0.12	0.29	0.65	0.18	0.69	0.45	1.00	0.33
Teacher's Aides:	0.36	0.21	0.11	0.14	0.23	0.17	0.73	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.53	0.13	0.89	0.53	1.00	0.26
All Teaching Staff:	0.47	0.26	0.17	0.16	0.28	0.23	0.74	0.23	0.13	0.27	0.59	0.16	0.76	0.48	1.00	0.30
Valued RAP Services:																
Training	0.55	0.67	0.62	0.67	0.81	0.57	0.48	0.57	0.52	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.69	0.71	1.00	0.63
Technical Assistance	0.15	0.24	0.29	0.10	0.05	0.29	0.14	0.14	0.05	0.05	0.10	0.19	0.23	0.10	0.33	0.15
Coming Onsite for T/TA	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.33	0.10	0.23	0.10	0.67	0.08
Referral to Resources	0.05	0.24	0.00	0.05	0.14	0.10	0.14	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.23	0.10	0.00	0.09
Information	0.10	0.14	0.05	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.33	0.33	0.05	0.33	0.10	0.33	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.18
Materials	0.15	0.19	0.10	0.38	0.14	0.29	0.48	0.52	0.29	0.24	0.33	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.00	0.25
Other Services*	0.40	0.57	0.29	0.29	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.29	0.10	0.33	0.29	0.33	0.46	0.52	0.67	0.33
No Contact/Don't Know*	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
Average Number of Types of RAP Services Cited by HS's*	1.45	2.05	1.38	1.62	1.67	1.67	1.86	1.90	1.19	1.76	1.81	1.76	2.00	1.67	2.67	1.70
Problems with RAP: Proportions Saying...																
No	0.95	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.90	0.95	0.95	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.97
Yes**	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.03
Total***	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

NOTES: * A list of the other valued services cited by the Head Starts is provided separately. Averages exclude "No Contact" and "Don't Know" responses.
** See text for details. Problems were infrequent and no particular type of problem was cited repeatedly.
*** There were four "Don't Know" responses to this item—one at Portage and three at Texas Tech.

materials, up slightly from last year, and 18 percent cited provision of information, down slightly from 1982-83. Technical assistance is mentioned by 15 percent of the respondents, on-site work with Head Starts by eight percent, and referral to other resources by nine percent. The average number of different kinds of valued services noted by the respondents has increased slightly since 1982-83, from 1.65 to 1.70. These data are also provided in Table 3.5.

Within the RAPs, training is especially significant for Head Starts served by the Alaska and Mississippi projects. The technical assistance categories are somewhat more likely to be mentioned by grantees served by NYU, Region III, Mississippi, Denver (for on-site work), Pacific, and Alaska RAPs. Referral to other resources is a service cited by more than a fifth of the grantees served by NYU and the Pacific RAP; it is not mentioned at all by those served by Region III, Los Angeles, or Alaska. The University of Illinois, Portage, and Chapel Hill RAPs are especially likely to be cited for their materials.

"Other" valued services mentioned include, by RAP:

- New England: availability; helping out "however and whenever"; facilitating exchanges, RAP as a resource for Head Starts
- NYU: availability/easily accessed; quick response; mentions of work on SEA agreement, linkages with Head Starts across the county.
- Region III: availability/accessibility/currency.
- Chapel Hill: availability. Also mentions of newsletter; personal contact with RAP's staff.
- Nashville: availability; speedy response, access to RAP's resource library, updates on legislation and regulations.
- Mississippi: availability; being a resource when needed, support.
- Illinois: availability. Also mention of newsletter.
- Portage: availability; handicap coordinators' meetings.
- Texas Tech: availability.
- Region VII: availability. Also mentions of newsletter, and of facilitation work among coordinators and directors.
- Denver: availability. Backup for other resources, and for keeping Head Starts current.
- Los Angeles: availability and accessibility. Also mentions of RAP's value in building a network with LEA's, SEA's.
- Pacific: network aspects: channel for information sharing and coordination among grantees, agencies, state and national levels; also mention of value to Head Start children.

- Portland: availability. Also mentions of work with SEA, networking importance of the RAP, knowledgeability and resourcefulness of RAP staff.

- Alaska: availability--"always there."

Clearly "availability" is a significant benefit. Knowing that a RAP can be called upon makes it possible for Head Starts to accept service to handicapped children with confidence that they can obtain whatever is needed to do the job.

Problems

The last telephone survey item is also summarized in Table 3.5. Three percent of the sampled Head Starts mentioned problems with the RAP program, when invited to do so. In 1982-83, the comparable statistic was six percent. No grantees cited problems in the cases of Region III, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Mississippi, the University of Illinois, Texas Tech, Portland State, and Alaska. The problems that were noted were not, on the whole, exceptionally major matters:

- At New England, one respondent thought coordination and timing of meetings could be better.

- At NYU, one respondent thought training work was too repetitive; another thought training should be more basic, and commented on the duplication between the PIR and RAP census.

- At Portage, one respondent reported "no dealings" with the RAP, and this was treated as a reported problem.

- At Region VII, one respondent had some difficulty in initially contacting the RAP, and another reported a decrease in attention from RAP during a year when the program needed more.

- At Los Angeles, one respondent no longer expects much from the program, saying that their state gets shortchanged on RAP services.

- At Pacific, a respondent complained that RAP's presentation before a Head Start directors' meeting extended the session by one day, thereby costing the Head Starts additional per diems.

Summary

As in the past, the overall reading obtained for RAPs from the Head Start grantees is a favorable one. Comparative data for 1980-1984 are provided in Table 3.6, Comparison of Selected Head Start Responses, 1980-1984. Overall, results on the broad "satisfaction" score are at an all-time high, as are the variety of types of contacts reported between RAPs and Head Starts.

Conduct State Training Workshops

RAPs focus their efforts to train Head Start teaching staff each year by planning and implementing mainstreaming conferences. These conferences began in 1978 as statewide two-day conferences highlighting a series of eight ACYF manuals on handicapping conditions. They have evolved into an array of offerings, ranging from one day site

TABLE 3.6: COMPARISON OF SELECTED HEAD START RESPONSES, 1980-1984

Selected Survey Items	Year: 1980-81:	1981-82:	1982-83:	1983-84:
Mean Satisfaction "Grade"	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.5
Average Number of Reported Types of Contact:	3.8	4.6	4.2	5.0
Types of Reported Contact: Percentages Mentioning...				
...Mainstreaming training conferences	81%	82%	86%	84%
...Mass mailings	58%	63%	68%	69%
...Information exchanges	60%	46%	61%	60%
...Materials	46%	55%	52%	60%
..."Other" contacts	23%	68%	27%	64%
...Training, by RAP or by others	37%	41%	56%	59%
...Technical assistance, by RAP or by others	19%	25%	20%	26%
...LEA Agreements	5%	11%	7%	10%

visits to observe specific children to regional conferences for handicap coordinators, as well as the traditional statewide conference for teaching staff. Each variation has reflected the efforts of RAPs to be responsive to the needs of the grantees they serve. This task is of major importance to RAPs.

This year RAPs trained 6,468 Head Start teachers, 34 percent of the nation's complement (see Table 3.7, Participation in RAP Mainstreaming Conferences, 1983-84). For the sixth year in a row, the network has met ACYF's goal of training at least one third of Head Start's teachers. In addition, RAPs trained 3,628 teacher aides (21% of the total), and 5,319 others, for a total of 15,415 training participants in 1983-84. This year the network also succeeded in attracting 86 percent of all Head Start grantees to the 159 conferences. Network-wide, these percentages are very similar to those of 1982-83 found in Table 3.8, Staff Trained by RAPs at Mainstreaming Conferences, 1979 1984. A closer look at individual variations among RAPs follows.

Estimating The Level of Participation

Estimates of the numbers of Head Start grantees, teachers, and other kinds of persons reached by mainstreaming conferences are obtained from two separate sources in the RAP evaluations. The figures cited immediately above are taken from data gathered in site visits to the RAPs by the evaluation team. The data are RAP-gathered estimates of the overall numbers of grantees and staff they serve, plus counts of the numbers of grantees and staff actually attending conferences. The data may be obtained in several ways--from ACYF regional offices, from RAP needs assessment surveys and other canvasses of Head Starts, or from official records and documents like the Head Start handicap survey. Sources of error in these kinds of data sources could include such technical problems as non-response bias in canvasses and needs assessment surveys, and definitional discrepancies.

The data on mainstreaming participation presented earlier in Task 1 are obtained in an entirely different way, from the telephone survey of Head Starts conducted for the annual RAP evaluations. Two kinds of survey items are involved. Grantees are asked if their contact with the RAP includes mainstreaming conferences; this yields information on participation at the Head Start project level. They are also asked to state the total number of teachers and teacher's aides in their program, and then to indicate the number of those persons attending mainstreaming training during 1983-84. These data provide measures of mainstreaming conference participation for each RAP's sample of Head Starts.

Sources of error in the case of the telephone survey data can include definitional problems, just as with RAP-supplied data (e.g., a Head Start respondent may not define "mainstreaming conference" or "teaching staff" in exactly the same way the RAP does). Non-response bias is not a significant problem with the Head Start phone surveys; virtually all selected Head Starts cooperated. One new source of error, at least for most RAPs, is sampling variance. (For example, suppose that in actual fact Texas Tech were to reach exactly 122 of its 147 Head Start grantees with mainstreaming training, or 83 percent. It is mathematically impossible to match this result with data based on a sample of 21 cases; the closest possible outcomes are 81 and 86 percent, respectively. So some discrepancies must be expected simply because sampling has been introduced.) Another new source of error is hazy recollection by respondents, especially in the cases of RAPs which do a great deal of their mainstreaming training in the first half of the program year, long before the telephone survey takes place.

Such differences of method can lead to inconsistencies between estimates of mainstreaming participation. Definitions and classification procedures for

Table 3.7

PARTICIPATION IN RAP MAINSTREAMING TRAINING CONFERENCES, 1983-84

RAP	Number of Conferences	Percent Attending Training Conferences, of All:			
		Grantees	Teachers	Aides	Teaching Staff
NewEngland	8	89	47	19	33
NYU	5	93[b]	25	9	17
Region III	9	84	43	23	33
Chapel Hill	10	86	18	6	12
Nashville	8	87	24	20	22
Mississippi	6	87	21	18	20
U. of Illinois*	12	77	37	30	34
Portage	7	92	31	18	25
Texas Tech	20	79	57	47	52
Region VII	17	90	46	45	46
U. of Denver	27	93	53	36	45
Los Angeles	10	91	23	5	14
Pacific	12	92	49	53	50
Portland State U.	7	84	36	29	32
Alaska	2	100	45	27	33
All RAPs	159[a]	86	34	21	28

[a]E. St. Louis conference co-sponsored by University of Illinois and Region VII RAPs; only counted once in total

[b]Based on 81 grantees; 1 grantee not funded until after mainstreaming conference had been conducted

Table 3.8
Staff Trained By RAPs At Mainstreaming Conferences
1979 - 1984

	1978-1979	1979-1980	1980 1981	1981-1982	1982-1983	1983-1984
Number of Grantees with Staff Participating in Conferences	1,033	942	887	913	936	938
Number of Trainees:						
Teaching Staff	8,660	8,216	7,815	8,878	10,430	10,096
Other Personnel	2,636	3,236	3,272	4,400	4,977	5,319
Total Trainees	11,296	11,452	11,087	13,278	15,407	15,415

determining who is a teacher can vary, especially in the rules used to decide the placement of people with more than one job title (such as teachers who are also component coordinators). Head Starts contacted by RLA's telephone survey may have imperfect recollections of attendance by staff at conferences, or may count attendance at other kinds of training sessions that would not have been classed by a RAP as "mainstreaming training." Such errors would lead to higher estimates of participation in mainstreaming training from the phone survey than from RAP data.

The reverse problem can also occur. A RAP whose sponsoring agency has a lengthy history as a trainer in an area, like Chapel Hill or Texas Tech, may find that its mainstreaming training is not identified as such by grantees, who may confuse it with other training activities they have received from the same parties. In such cases RAPs will be penalized in the evaluation process if they do not clearly present "mainstreaming training conferences" as distinct, RAP-related events.

Historically, the two separate approaches to the measurement of RAP mainstream training participation have produced remarkably similar estimates of overall, network-wide attendance in these sessions, but at the level of individual RAPs there have been discrepancies, some of them notable. And so it is this year.

There are three main measures of participation in RAP mainstreaming training: the number of Head Start grantees reached, the proportion of Head Start teachers reached, and the share of all Head Start teaching staff reached. On an overall basis, the RAP-generated data indicates that 86 percent of all Head Starts in the nation were reached by mainstreaming training in 1983-84. The corresponding figure from the RLA sample survey is 84 percent. RAP data indicate that 34 percent of all Head Start teachers were reached; the survey estimate is 33 percent. RAP data indicate that 28 percent of all Head Start teaching staff, including teaching aides, participated in mainstream training; the sample survey figure is 30 percent. Data from the RAPs was provided in Table 3.7, above; data from the survey appeared in Tables 3.4 (for grantee participation) and 3.5 (for teacher and teaching staff participation) of the previous subsection.

There is also close agreement between the two sources of estimates on the extent of mainstreaming participation at the RAP level, in the cases of the NYU, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Mississippi, Denver, and Los Angeles RAPs. There are more significant, but still limited, discrepancies in the data for New England, Portage, Region VII, Pacific, and Portland State:

- New England's own data indicate 33 percent of the Head Start teaching staff in its service area (Region I) attended mainstreaming conferences in 1983-84; the Head Starts sampled in the survey say 47 percent of their total teaching staff had this training.

- Portage's own figures say 92 percent of the Head Starts in its service area sent at least one representative to its mainstreaming conferences; 76 percent of the sampled Head Starts said they had participated.

- Region VII's figures indicate the RAP reached 46 percent of both teachers and all teaching staff in its service area; the sampled Head Starts report participation by 29 and 27 percent, respectively.

- Pacific's data say the RAP reached 49 percent of all Head Start teachers in its area and 50 percent of all Head Start teaching staff; the survey of Head Starts, which included all grantees served by the RAP, yielded corresponding figures of 69 percent and 76 percent, respectively.

- Portland State's situation is similar: its data say the RAP reached 36 percent of the teachers and 32 percent of all teaching staff, but the sampled Head Starts report 45 percent and 48 percent, respectively.

Thus, RAP estimates are pessimistic in the cases of New England teaching staff, and in the cases of both teachers and all teaching staff at the Pacific and Portland RAPs; RAP estimates are optimistic in the case of Portage grantees and Region VII teachers and teaching staff.

Two of the remaining RAPs display wider discrepancies for these estimates, and in each case the RAP's own data is the more pessimistic:

- The Alaska RAP's own figures say that 45 percent of the Head Start teachers, and 33 percent of all Head Start teaching staff, were reached in mainstreaming conferences. The grantees, all of whom were reached by the phone survey, say that 100 percent of the teaching staff participated. The RAP's figures are pessimistic; perhaps some grantees counted training experiences that the RAP did not classify under the heading of mainstreaming.

- Data for the University of Illinois RAP show a similar if less dramatic difference: the RAP's own numbers say 37 percent of the teachers in its region, and 34 percent of all teaching staff, participated in its mainstreaming conferences; the sampled Head Starts indicated that 75 and 74 percent, respectively, had done so. A similar discrepancy was observed in the 1982 83 data for this RAP.

Two other RAPs report reaching significantly larger shares of grantees, teachers, and all Head Start teaching staff in mainstreaming conferences than are indicated by the sample survey data. In both cases, similar discrepancies occured in the evaluation data for 1982-83:

- The Region III RAP reports reaching 84 percent of its grantees, 43 percent of its teachers, and 33 percent of all Head Start teaching staff; 52 percent of the sample of grantees report participating in these conferences, sending 23 percent of their teachers and 17 percent of all their teaching staff.

- The Texas Tech RAP reports reaching 79 percent of all Head Starts in its region with mainstreaming training, 52 percent of the teachers, and 57 percent of all teaching staff. Of the sampled Head Starts from Region VI, 67 percent indicated that the Head Start had experienced contact with the RAP's mainstreaming conferences, but the same Head Starts estimated that only 12 percent of their teachers, and 13 percent of all teaching staff, had participated.

Since in these cases the same kinds of differences between the estimates appear from one year to the next, we are inclined to suspect that systematic biases must exist, either in definitions of training occasions or in the classification of Head Start workers. Either Head Starts or RAPs might count positions or particular training occasions in inconsistent ways. The question of which set of data to believe is a significant one for these RAPs. As noted in the discussion of the Head Start survey, RLA's own information on mainstreaming participation was doublechecked for these RAPs, calling all Head Starts back to confirm the original data they provided. However, this does not eliminate all possibilities of error in the survey numbers. At the same time, we do not have enough information on the precise manner of gathering the statistics used for the RAPs' own estimates. In the remaining discussions of mainstreaming participation, we use the RAPs' own data for the most part, but where this examination of the numbers has revealed potential difficulties, we add cautionary comments.

Grantees Attending Mainstreaming Training

The Alaska RAP trained all three of its grantees; the NYU, University of Denver, Pacific, Los Angeles, and Region VII RAPs all reached at least 90 percent, and all other RAPs reached at least 75 percent, of their Head Starts (Head Start survey data suggests lower grantee participation rates for Region III and Texas Tech).

The Nashville and University of Illinois RAPs increased the percentage of grantees who sent someone to mainstreaming training by 14 and 13 percent, respectively, compared to 1982-83. Nashville attempted to increase its flexibility in training options, and planned training delivery with Region IV's Specially Funded Cluster Coordinator (SFCs) at the beginning of the year. The University of Illinois produced professionally polished advance materials and agendas, and condensed training into a one-day format, usually on Fridays, to cut grantee costs and thereby increase participation. Small drops in participation by grantees were noted in New England (by 7 percent), Region III (by 11 percent) and Region VII (by 9 percent). In Region III, several Virginia grantees did not receive mainstreaming this year due to a misunderstanding about a training site. The RAP was also aware of several Pennsylvania grantees who had not attended. For both the New England and Region VII RAPs, the mainstreaming conferences were a major focus last year, and new commitments this year resulted in less concentrated attention on the conferences.

Teachers Trained

According to RAP data, thirty-four percent of Head Start teachers were trained in 1983-84. Among RAPs who trained a higher than average percentage of teachers were the University of Denver, Pacific, New England, Alaska, and University of Illinois RAPs. Alaska increased the number of teachers it trained, moving from 26 percent in 1982-83 to 45 percent in 1983-84, a 19 percent point difference.

Major drops in teacher attendance were found in Region VII. Last year in Region VII, the RAP had made teachers a training priority and trained the highest percentage in the network; this year the RAP also was actively involved in two additional projects on child abuse and deferred diagnosis, as well as the national Head Start meeting held in Kansas City, and mainstreaming training was a less prominent part of its work.

Others Trained

RAPs have always extended invitations to mainstreaming training to non-teaching Head Start staff. Who these "others" are has been an interesting index of differences

among RAP priorities from year to year. At the beginning, these non-teaching participants were mostly handicap and education coordinators; they were next most closely linked to the mainstreamed classroom.

Recognizing that mainstreaming must be an integrated effort, RAPs quickly broadened their target populations to other components of Head Starts, as well as parents and such support staff as cooks and bus drivers. Two years ago, social service staff became a top priority for the NYU RAP in particular and for others in general, following NYU's development of a training manual for social service workers. In the past two years, RAPs also opened their mainstreaming training to other members of the child care community and to public school personnel. There has been a slight trend toward including more supervisory staff, especially directors, in order to keep the importance of handicap training in the foreground and to insure follow through when teachers return to their centers. A more complete discussion of other types of personnel trained is found later in this section.

Strategies for Delivering Mainstreaming Training

The RAPs' mandate to meet the training needs of Head Start staff stimulates the development of new strategies each year, as RAPs plan and implement their mainstreaming conferences. Training content and format are rethought, as well as solutions to specific logistical problems. Annual needs assessments surface new ideas from grantees, and RAPs introduce timely topics based on their own knowledge of grantee needs as well as national and regional training trends. Each year there is fresh training material to be incorporated.

Four RAPs collaborated for the first time with another group or major service organization to conduct some of these conferences. The NYU RAP collaborated with the New York State Association for the Blind for a very large conference for their suburban county grantees; the Association provided the training site and shared other conference responsibilities with the RAP. The Portage RAP co-sponsored conferences with a large urban grantee and with the Child Development Training Program, among other groups. The Alaska RAP co-sponsored a very large conference with one of the Head Start grantees. The Chapel Hill RAP co-sponsored training in North Carolina, Georgia, and South Carolina with the State Training Facilities and Region IV Specially Funded Coordinators.

Broadening the Target Population

A network-wide thrust to foster coordination and to maintain attendance at training was evident. Conferences were specifically opened to greater child care communities by the NYU, Chapel Hill, and Pacific RAPs. Grantees in Region II (NYU) were urged by RAP to "Invite a Friend" to training (e.g., LEAs, Mental Health Centers, ARC, etc.) and to increase the attendance of Head Start parents. Child care professionals were invited to Chapel Hill's Florida conference, where a low $10 fee helped to offest expenses. The Texas Tech University RAP's training included new health training which drew health staff to its conferences. Texas Tech also invited State Education Agency personnel to make presentations, and trained new public school teachers in all five states in its region under a subcontract with the Texas Southern Leadership Development Program. The Los Angeles RAP designed sessions for handicap coordinators, co-hosted an entire conference for component coordinators, and conducted another mainstreaming conference specifically for directors and handicap coordinators.

Training Approaches Not Previously Used by Individual RAPs

A variety of new approaches were employed to make the training more relevant or fresh for participants and to meet particular regional needs. The NYU RAP introduced "Talking Between the Lines" at each conference, a workshop series on communicating with children in early childhood mainstreamed settings. The Region VII and Los Angeles RAPs focused on a single handicapping condition at some conferences. Similarly, the Region III RAP developed a conference which focused on behavior problems from several points of view. The Region VII RAP focused on working with parents/parental participation, and on hospitalization issues.

The University of Illinois RAP shortened its conferences to one day, and encouraged grantees to attend RAP conferences in other states if more convenient. Each of its conferences was hosted by a grantee which provided facilitators as well as audio-visual equipment and other planning support. To foster a sense of a shared experience among participants, the Region III RAP began some conferences with a large group general session in the morning. The Los Angeles RAP offered more grantees a choice between on-site training and cluster conferences; each Arizona grantee could opt for a second day of training in addition to the one-day state conference this year. Similarly, the University of Denver RAP encouraged grantees to request individualized on-site training, although it also offered statewide, cluster, and train-the-trainer formats. Grantees of the Nashville RAP were given wide options for the site and length of their conferences. The Portage Project RAP included evening social gatherings as a chance for informal networking.

Selection of Presenters

The importance of the trainers to the quality of RAP training is evident in the RAPs' thoughtful choices and preparation of presenters. The Portland State University RAP sent each consultant it hired a letter profiling the grantees who would be attending, the number and types of children with handicapping conditions served, prior training experience of participants, and what Head Start staff expected from training. Trainers were asked to provide bibliographies and glossaries of terms they intended to use. Agendas indicated which staff were targeted for specific workshop sessions. The Region VII RAP found it useful to recruit the same consultants for several conferences. The NYU RAP increased its efforts to use Head Start staff as presenters, especially for conferences outside a person's immediate locale. In Micronesia, the Pacific RAP stressed the role of the handicap coordinators as assistants, not merely participants, in the training, by consulting with them and involving them in the training presentations. Like the Portland State University RAP, the Pacific RAP used local specialists as presenters as much as possible.

Conference Design and Logistics

In designing conferences, the Texas Tech University RAP utilized information from Consolidated Management Reviews (CMR) and the Program Information Report (PIR) as a basis for assessing training needs and topics. The Region III RAP held a 4-day regional conference for the first time, featuring TEACH training in addition to its cluster conferences. The Pacific RAP worked intensively with the University of Hawaii to arrange for RAP training participants to receive course credits. The Portage Project RAP incorporated the arts into their conferences, by including a play about child abuse and a performance by a choir of deaf adults who signed while music played.

The University of Illinois RAP found it more efficient this year to preregister participants by grantee, rather than by individual names. This RAP found it very

helpful to publicize the entire training schedule in one brochure to inform grantees as early as August, which left more time for planning. The RAP prepared session facilitator notes for presenters which outlined the title of their session, location, introductory notes on presenters, audio visual needs and how the room was to be arranged. The Pacific RAP collaborated with other providers in developing the first regional training calendar for the entire Pacific area.

To encourage participants to arrive on time, the Mississippi RAP offered door prizes as incentives and left copies of mainstreaming manuals on a table to be taken on a first-come first-serve basis, rather than distributing them to participants.

Conference Problems

As in 1982-83, weather and facilities for training were problems encountered by some RAPs. The New England, NYU, and University of Denver RAPs had to cancel some training because of bad weather. The growing size of conferences continues to cause a problem for the NYU RAP, which has difficulty finding affordable facilities to accommodate all who wish to participate. The Chapel Hill RAP cannot easily find facilities which are accessible for presenters with orthopedic handicaps. Participants at some Pacific RAP conferences found meeting areas to be too cold, too hot, etc.

The Los Angeles RAP wrestled with an overenrollment problem at one conference. Both the Region VII and Portland State University RAPs were surprised by isolated instances of poor attendance among some grantees. A bomb threat interrupted a PSU conference. The University of Illinois RAP had difficulty planning one conference because the grantee liaison changed four or five times. In another instance, a delegate agency was never informed of the training by the grantee. A communication problem for the Region III RAP resulted in the cancellation of a conference which could not be rescheduled.

Many of Region IV's Specially Funded Coordinators, a group with whom the Chapel Hill RAP has always worked closely in planning its conferences, were new this year, so more details than usual fell to the RAP. Also, fewer RLA evaluations were returned at one conference, because participants were expected to complete another evaluation as well. Travel distances and funds were a constraint on attendance for Texas Tech University grantees.

The New England RAP felt it had much less time to plan conferences this year. One presenter scheduled for a PSU RAP conference died in a climbing accident just prior to training. The Nashville RAP twice encountered scheduling conflicts with Head Start Association meetings in setting RAP training dates. A presenter's style was a problem at one Mississippi RAP conference. When the Texas Tech University RAP staff found that the cafeteria it had expected to be able to use for lunch was closed, they quickly organized a picnic for participants.

Target Groups Other Than Teaching Staff

Training for teachers, like services to children with handicapping conditions, is not delivered in a vacuum. The content of RAP mainstreaming conferences demonstrates the interrelatedness of handicap services with all Head Start components, and workshops are also planned for administrative and other non-teaching personnel. This year, for example, some mainstreaming training sessions were designed for Foster Grandparents who work in Head Start classrooms, and teens (Alaska RAP); health, nutrition, and family services staffs (PSU RAP); health coordinators (Texas Tech RAP); and the administrators who plan staff in-service training (University of Illinois RAP). The University of Denver RAP conducted social service training for one of its large grantees. The NYU RAP trained social service workers and home-based staff. Training

was designed with day care and public school personnel in mind by the Portage, Region VII, and Alaska RAPs.

Many conference sessions were geared to Head Start supervisory and administrative staff whose knowledge and support of the handicap component are important to its operation. The Texas Tech University RAP conducted sessions on handicap plans for handicap coordinators. Component integration, team building, collaboration, and volunteers were topics of sessions held for coordinators from all components -- handicap, education, parent involvement, social services, health -- at conferences sponsored by the Region III, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Mississippi, University of Denver, and Portland State University RAPs. The Los Angeles RAP included two half-day sessions at six conferences specifically for supervisory staff who work on implementing IEPs with teachers and aides. The "All Coordinators Conference" was a joint effort planned by this RAP, the California Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Office, and the National Bilingual/Multicultural Resource Center. Local coordinators from each component area met in separate sessions with consultants in the areas of education, special education, health, social services, home-based and parent involvement. Another two-day conference for directors and handicap coordinators covered such management issues as PA26, the PIR, and monitoring. The University of Denver RAP conducted sessions for directors (on PA26) at its three state-wide conferences, as did the NYU RAP at several conferences.

Workshops for parents, or about working with families, were included on conference agendas by several of the RAPs, including the Mississippi and Region VII RAPs. The Region III, University of Denver, and Alaska RAPs offered workshops, for example, on the process of parents' acceptance of their children's handicaps. The Nashville RAP presented an overview of Head Start handicap services for parent participants. The Pacific RAP assisted with the planning and presentations at the Hilo, Hawaii "Parent Conference," conducted by and for Head Start parents. Parents were a target training group at several of the Portage RAP's conferences, and other conferences focused on social services staff, component staff, and personnel from the greater child care community.

Training Practices to Share with Other RAPs

New planning procedures, topics, materials, and other practices are discovered by RAPs each year, and RAPs benefit from each other's successful new practices. Among ideas on training formats which RAPs wanted to share were the use of a regionwide workshop (Region III) or a mainstreaming conference on one topic only (University of Denver), and a conference for all component coordinators to foster intercomponent coordination (Los Angeles). The NYU, Chapel Hill, and Portage Project RAPs co-sponsored conferences with other service provider groups as means of diversifying workshop discussion, making contacts, and increasing awareness of Head Start's handicap effort. The Alaska RAP preferred to present at other groups' training sessions to reach non-Head Start staff, rather than opening Head Start training to them. The Chapel Hill, Mississippi, University of Illinois, and Pacific RAPs found it very helpful to share responsibilities for arranging and facilitating training with local or regional Head Start staff. Planning for RAP training in Region VI was aided by meetings of T/TA providers and Head Start personnel at each state's preservice conference in later summer.

The Nashville RAP's "Make and Take" workshops are favorites among new and experienced teachers alike, because arts and crafts ideas can be used in the classroom the next day. The University of Denver RAP staff distributed several RAP-developed training manuals with information and activities on "Self Concept and the Handicapped Child," "Mainstreaming the Visually Impaired Child," "Language Stimulation in the Classroom,"

and "Observation and Developmental Assessment." The Pacific RAP has incorporated the use of locally available materials for making the "New Friends" dolls, and also had the curriculum translated for use in Micronesia. The"What If You Couldn't" series of simulated handicap experiences is highly recommended as a resource by the Pacific RAP.

Among new ideas for training presentations, several RAPs incorporated music and dramatics to set a tone, stimulate involvement, promote discussion, and serve as an "ice breaker" (Chapel Hill, Portage, and University of Illinois). Chapel Hill also held a film festival which led to informal discussions. The Mississippi RAP recorded a tape to replace the audio portion of a slide tape that was not judged appropriate for Head Start staff. Both the University of Illinois and Region VII RAPs found Chapel Hill's "Issues in Mainstreaming" to be an excellent audiovisual training material. The Portage RAP designed some training around specific themes (e.g., self-concept, behavior management, positive discipline). The PSU RAP used the themes suggested by grantees who completed a "Design A Workshop" form attached to last year's needs assessment. Suggestions regarding presentations also included Chapel Hill's Correlated Day Training, used by Nashville, and the inclusion of a panel of Regional Office staff to answer grantee staff's questions (Los Angeles). Region VII RAP training addressed apprehensions about serving severely impaired children by showing slides from classrooms, discussing cost issues, and dealing directly with teacher's fears.

Other successful practices which RAPs wanted to share included:

- Assigning a troubleshooter at each conference (Chapel Hill)
- Using disabled adult presenters (Chapel Hill)
- Using small group discussions prior to a discussion by the entire assembly (Mississippi)
- Providing presenters with background information on their Head Start audiences (University of Illinois and PSU)
- Awarding certificates for participation (University of Illinois)
- Holding an evening reception for handicap coordinators (Portage and Chapel Hill)
- Providing university credit (Pacific)

Participant Assessments of the Mainstreaming Conferences

RLA's evaluation of the impact of these conferences drew, as in the past, on a short participant's assessment form. Two conferences from each of the RAPs were covered. All trainees at the selected conferences were provided with assessment forms. A total of 1,953 trainees participated in the assessments (see Table 3.9). This is somewhat fewer cases than have been employed at past RAP evaluations for this part of the study (for example, the 1982-83 evaluation used 2,767 trainee cases). The reduction in the size of the data base seems to have had few if any effects on the outcomes of the analysis. Most results are quite similar to those observed in the past.

In 1982-83, the network reached 15,407 trainees in mainstreaming conferences, a substantial increase compared to earlier years. As noted already, in 1983-84, the network maintained this level of effort, reporting 15,415 participants in all. In addition, there was a small increase in the proportion of trainees who were Head Start

TABLE 3.9·NUMBER OF STATE TRAINING CONFERENCES AND TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

RAP:	Conferences:		Participants:	
	Total Number:	Number Evaluated	Total Number:	Evaluation Responses:
New England	8	2	770	109
NYU	5	2	1491	450
Region III	9	2	1467	116
Chapel Hill	10	2	852	111
Nashville	8	2	897	165
Mississippi	6	2	660	152
U. of Illinois	12	2	1770	119
Portage	7	2	1164	158
Texas Tech	20	2	2709	81
Region VII	17	2	930	73
U. of Denver	27	2	677	64
Los Angeles	10	2	1152	199
Pacific	12	2	362	46
PSU	7	2	443	60
Alaska	2	2	71	50
ALL RAPS:	159*	30	15415	1953

*One less than total of 160 conferences listed above; one was jointly sponsored by the University of Illinois and Region VII RAPs, and has been counted twice in the RAP-by-RAP data.

teaching staff (the primary target for this activity), from 64 percent in 1982-83 to 66 percent in 1983-84.

The general distribution of mainstreaming trainees among the RAPs also is very similar to that observed in 1982-83. As before, Texas Tech reported the largest number of participants. The Alaska and Nashville RAPs had the largest relative increases in trainee attendance, compared to the previous year, while the Region VII RAP had the largest relative decrease.

Background of Trainees

Earlier, we noted that 34 percent of all Head Start teachers participated in RAP mainstreaming training in 1983-84. Table 3.10 provides a different statistic, the proportion of all trainees who are Head Start teachers (33 percent). If teaching aides and home visitors are also counted, teaching personnel account for 66 percent of this year's trainees, as already noted. If other Head Start workers such as handicap coordinators, social service workers, administrators, cooks, parent volunteers, etc., are counted, Head Start staff account for almost all trainees. A few day care and other non-Head Start persons did participate in 1983-84, as in earlier years.

Rather broad variations from RAP to RAP in the makeup of their mainstreaming trainees were noticed in 1982-83. For example, teachers made up 12 percent of the trainees in Alaska, but 57 percent of the trainees in Mississippi. These differences are narrower for 1983-84, and range from 19 percent at Portage to 43 percent at Portland State. As in the earlier year, the Mississippi trainees are the most likely of all to be teaching staff.

Handicap coordinators continue to make up a significant group of mainstreaming trainees, as do social service workers and other general Head Start staff (ranging from cooks and drivers to other component coordinators and administrators). Chapel Hill has a long record of work with the Specially-Funded Coordinators, or SFCs, which have been active in Region IV, and in 1983-84 it was the RAP most likely to include handicap coordinators in its mainstreaming training (as noted above, many of the SFCs were new this year). The NYU RAP has stressed reaching social service workers, and it reached more of them than other RAPs in 1983-84, as it has before. Parents were particularly likely to receive mainstreaming training in conferences arranged by the Alaska, Pacific, Portage, and Region III RAPs. Other Head Start personnel were especially likely to have been trained by the Denver and University of Illinois RAPs. Only the Portland State University RAP trained more than a small number of non-Head Start personnel. These variations in outcomes parallel those in the RAPs' mainstreaming training plans and priorities, described above.

Two other types of data have been tracked for these trainees, with results for 1983-84 in Table 3.11. Overall, at least 76 percent worked either directly or indirectly with handicapped children. (We say "at least" because cases that did not respond to the question at all are included in the total, and some of these may also work with the children.) The similar figure for 1982-83 was 79 percent. In the past, trainees at Mississippi have been the least likely to report contact with handicapped children; this is no longer the case. Only 38 percent of those trained by the Alaska RAP reported such contact. Fifty percent of those trained by the Pacific RAP had contact with handicapped children. The next-highest figures were reported by the Region VII RAP (63 percent), and Mississippi (64 percent). At the other end of the distribution, 83 percent of the Nashville trainees had contact with the handicapped, as did 84 percent of those at the Illinois and New England RAPs, 85 percent of those trained by Chapel Hill, 88 percent of those trained by the University of Denver, and 91 percent of those reached by the Portland State University RAP.

TABLE 3.10: BACKGROUND OF RAP TRAINING PARTICIPANTS: TYPES OF TRAINEES, BY RAP
(Note: proportions shown--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. All figures are rounded).

RAP:	Head Start Staff: Teaching Staff: H.S. Teachers	Teaching Aides	Home Visitor	Total, Teaching	Other Staff: HC Coord	Social Service	H.S. Parent	Other HS*	Total, Head Start Staff	Non-Head Start Staff: Day Care	Other Non-HS	No Answer to item	Total, All Trainees
New England	0.37	0.25	0.09	0.71	0.12	0.05	0.00	0.11	0.98	0.00	0.02	0.00	1.00
NYU	0.30	0.18	0.12	0.60	0.06	0.19	0.06	0.08	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	1.00
Region III	0.32	0.25	0.11	0.68	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.09	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.02	1.00
Chapel Hill	0.36	0.17	0.02	0.55	0.18	0.05	0.01	0.16	0.95	0.01	0.04	0.00	1.00
Nashville	0.39	0.28	0.02	0.69	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.13	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.02	1.00
Mississippi	0.41	0.49	0.00	0.90	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.98	0.00	0.01	0.01	1.00
U. of Illinois	0.36	0.24	0.05	0.65	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.22	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	1.00
Portage	0.19	0.22	0.16	0.57	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.13	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.01	1.00
Texas Tech	0.42	0.31	0.02	0.75	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.11	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.02	1.00
Region VII	0.30	0.33	0.12	0.75	0.03	0.07	0.00	0.14	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.01	1.00
U. of Denver	0.25	0.19	0.11	0.55	0.13	0.05	0.00	0.28	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Los Angeles	0.40	0.18	0.14	0.72	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.16	0.97	0.02	0.00	0.01	1.00
Pacific	0.24	0.17	0.07	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.17	0.80	0.02	0.11	0.07	1.00
PSU	0.43	0.23	0.00	0.67	0.07	0.08	0.02	0.17	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Alaska	0.24	0.22	0.02	0.48	0.02	0.02	0.30	0.12	0.94	0.00	0.02	0.04	1.00
ALL RAPS:	0.33	0.24	0.08	0.66	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.13	0.98	0.00	0.01	0.01	1.00

*Includes Head Start Directors, Other HS Component Coordinators, consultants (if they identified themselves as Head Start staff), other assistants and aides, nurses, cooks, drivers, and others identifying themselves as Head Start staff but not stating their specific positions. Proportions are based on total number of cases.

68

TABLE 3.11: ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND OF TRAINEES: WORK W/HC CHILDREN; PREVIOUS RAP TRAINING
(Note: proportions shown--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. All figures are rounded)*

RAP:	Work With Handicapped Children?					Attend RAP Training Before?			
	Yes, Direct	Yes, Indirect	No Contact	No Ans.	Total, All:	Yes, Before	No--New Trainee	No Answer	Total, All:
New England	0.59	0.25	0.16	0.01	1.00	0.58	0.42	0.00	1.00
NYU	0.57	0.21	0.18	0.04	1.00	0.46	0.53	0.01	1.00
Region III	0.59	0.16	0.16	0.08	1.00	0.57	0.36	0.07	1.00
Chapel Hill	0.49	0.36	0.12	0.04	1.00	0.57	0.43	0.00	1.00
Nashville	0.64	0.19	0.12	0.05	1.00	0.65	0.28	0.07	1.00
Mississippi	0.51	0.13	0.32	0.05	1.00	0.41	0.55	0.04	1.00
U. of Illinois	0.56	0.28	0.12	0.04	1.00	0.50	0.47	0.03	1.00
Portage	0.51	0.24	0.22	0.03	1.00	0.44	0.54	0.01	1.00
Texas Tech	0.60	0.19	0.14	0.07	1.00	0.53	0.42	0.05	1.00
Region VII	0.53	0.10	0.34	0.03	1.00	0.68	0.27	0.04	1.00
U. of Denver	0.61	0.27	0.09	0.03	1.00	0.63	0.31	0.06	1.00
Los Angeles	0.61	0.16	0.18	0.05	1.00	0.36	0.58	0.06	1.00
Pacific	0.43	0.07	0.39	0.11	1.00	0.41	0.43	0.15	1.00
PSU	0.78	0.13	0.07	0.02	1.00	0.70	0.28	0.02	1.00
Alaska	0.26	0.12	0.58	0.04	1.00	0.36	0.62	0.02	1.00
ALL RAPS:	0.56	0.20	0.19	0.04	1.00	0.50	0.46	0.04	1.00

* Proportions are based on total number of cases, given in Table 3.9.

The number of trainees with previous exposure to RAP mainstreaming training in the past rose in 1983-84 to 50 percent, compared to 46 percent in 1981-82 and 1982-83. Several RAPs continued to reach high proportions of participants with no previous contact with this training, however, including the Alaska RAP, where 62 percent had not participated before. The Pacific RAP also increased its share of new mainstreaming training participants, compared to 1982-83, while the Region VII RAP had the largest relative drop in trainees reached for the first time (from 53 percent in 1982-83 to 27 percent in 1983-84). All these numbers are influenced by such variations as Head Start staff turnover rates, the overall numbers of Head Start staff in the various federal regions, and year-to-year variations in RAP program emphases (like Region VII's special mainstreaming training efforts in 1982-83).

What Trainees Liked Best

As in 1982-83, each sampled participant in RAP mainstreaming training conferences was asked an open-ended question about what they liked best about the training. The responses are numerous and varied; a complete listing is available for detailed inspection by individual RAPs. Only the most common types of responses are mentioned in the highlights below:

- New England: "The 'New Friends' Workshop..." "Really enjoyed the techniques in the 'Challenge' workshop..." "Excellent trainers and information..."
- NYU: "All the workshops are excellent, relevant to classroom problems..." "Presenters were very open and gave positive focuses on subjects..." "Sharing actual experiences with others..." "The Creative Drama workshop..."
- Region III: "Trainers were very knowledgeable, very informative..." "New techniques I can use in the classroom--I will try some of the suggestions..." "Concrete information, with humor; the ability to answer specific questions about our child..."
- Chapel Hill: "Interesting, useful, informative..." "Presentations were made on a level that classroom teachers could easily understand..." "The workshop on directors of sexual abuse..."
- Nashville: "Liked it all..." "The film 'Krista' was super ..." "Arts and crafts..." "Liked the interaction between trainers and trainees, humor, discussions..." "The speech and language workshop..."
- Mississippi: "I liked the special sessions on child abuse and 'Child in Grief'..." "The sessions were weell planned and presented..." "Ireally enjoyed meeting people from the other centers across the state..."
- University of Illinois: "It was well organized, the location was nice, the presenters were excellent..." "The child abuse workshop..." "I like the new assessment tools..."
- Portage: "Presented in an enthusiastic, competent manner..."

"The self-esteem class..." "Sessions were fast moving and interesting..."

- Texas Tech: "All areas of the training were good..." "The Home Learning Kits..." "Information that can be used in my school..."

- Region VII: "Slides, handouts were excellent..." "Very well presented..." "The people were friendly, would answer any questions..."

- University of Denver: "Trainers gave some specific ideas to use with kids..." "Presenters were well informed and enthusiastic..." "Handouts, films, didn't have to take notes..."

- Los Angeles: "Video tapes and discussion..." "Everything was useful and informative..." "The group participation, sharing ideas..." "Comfortable environment, excelent instructors..."

- Pacific: "Handouts, and the hands-on experience..." "The help, information, and suggestions..."

- Portland State University: "All useful information, didn't feel time was wasted..." "Handouts were really helpful, I gathered good resources..."

- Alaska: "New insights on different age developments..." "The whole workshop was informative..." "Good slide show on preschool children..." "New materials..."

Overall, 33 percent of the trainees declined to respond to the question. At the Pacific RAP, the number nonresponding was twice as great, at 67 percent, a difference which may be due to language problems (this is the only completely open-ended item in the trainee's survey form). At the Mississippi RAP, only 16 percent of the trainees failed to write in a best-liked aspect of their training. At all other RAPs, the share of trainees not responding to this item varied between 28 and 44 percent.

Overall Satisfaction

Following a practice established in the first evaluation of the RAP program, the sampled trainees were invited to rate their experiences at the mainstreaming conferences on an "Excellent"/"Good"/"fair"/"Poor" basis, with the scores coded on the familiar academic four-point scale where "Excellent" equals four, "Good" equals three, etc. The overall average score for the network as a whole, 3.53, was identical to that obtained for mainstreaming conference trainees in 1982-83. On a RAP-by-RAP basis, averaged scores ranged from 3.10 for conferences arranged by the University of Illinois to 3.72 for those done by Texas Tech. The Mississippi RAP also got an outstanding "grade" (3.68) from its trainees, as it has before, and this RAP's score was closely followed by those for the Chapel Hill and Portage RAPs (3.64), the Region III RAP (3.63), and the Portland State RAP (3.62). Compared to 1982-83, the NYU, Portage, Texas Tech, and PSU RAPs all improved their average ratings for mainstreaming training conferences, while there were moderate decreases in scores for New England, Nashville, Illinois, Pacific, and Alaska. Illinois also had the lowest conference rating score in 1982-83, and was the only RAP that year where less than half of the trainees were willing to rate the training as "Excellent." This year, this trend has accelerated, and only 18 percent of Illinois' participants are willing to use the

"Excellent" rating. Trainees served by two other RAPs (New England and Alaska) also fell well short of the 50 percent mark in awarding "Excellent" ratings. See Table 3.12.

Participants in the training assessments are invited to add comments when they give these ratings, and many did so in 1983-84. Those giving "Excellent" ratings tend to add general compliments or to single out particular sessions, presenters, etc., which they enjoyed. These comments tend to be very similar to those given when respondents were asked a separate question about what they liked best about the training (see below). Those giving other responses were more likely to be critical; a sampling of such comments, drawn from all of the RAPs:

- "We need to start on time."
- "Could have been more specific."
- "Workshops varied; I felt one was excellent, others were not."
- "More hands-on work needed, less lecturing."
- "Need more time."
- "Not as comprehensive as I thought it would be."
- "Content was too basic, not advanced enough."

These examples are typical of the less positive comments in that they are relatively mild complaints. The overwhelming majority of comments were highly favorable to both the training and the RAPs. A complete listing of all comments made in conjunction with RAP training conference ratings is available for review by individual RAPs, as are similar lists of responses to the question about what trainees liked best, discussed separately below.

Workshop Topics

The conference assessment forms ask respondents to check off the topics covered in the workshops they attended. For the network as a whole, the results for this item are virtually unchanged from 1982-83: mainstreaming training itself is the most commonly cited workshop topic, mentioned by 64 percent of the participants; workshops on working with families of the handicapped and on attitudes toward the handicapped are the next most frequently mentioned topics, followed by sessions on planning for each child and curriculum techniques; cited least often, by 16-17 percent of the trainees, are workshops on working with public schools, intercomponent coordination, and "other" topics, a residual category that included workshops on social and emotional development, stress management and burnout, mobilizing volunteers, communications, genetics, drama as a classroom tool, advocacy, music in the classroom, self-esteem and self-concept of children, and other miscellaneous subjects. See Table 3.13.

As in past RAP evaluations, the average number of topics cited by trainees varied from one RAP to another. Overall, an average of 6.31 topics were mentioned. Individual RAPs tended to have similar numbers of topics cited as in the past, although trainees at Mississippi changed from an average of 7.74 workshop citations in 1982-83 to over 10 citations in 1983-84, while those at Alaska dropped from 9.12 citations in 1982-83 to less than four citations this year.

TABLE 3 12: SATISFACTION WITH MAINSTREAMING TRAINING, BY RAP
(Note: average "grade" weighted as shown, with "no answers" excluded)

RAP:	Proportion Rating Satisfaction as:					Total, All:	Average "Grade"*
	Excellent(=4)	Good (=3)	Fair (=2)	Poor (=1)	No Answer		
New England	0.39	0.52	0.05	0.00	0.04	1.00	3.36
NYU	0.59	0.37	0.02	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.58
Region III	0.64	0.34	0.01	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.63
Chapel Hill	0.64	0.31	0.02	0.00	0.04	1.00	3.64
Nashville	0.49	0.45	0.02	0.00	0.04	1.00	3.48
Mississippi	0.68	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.68
U. of Illinois	0.18	0.73	0.08	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.10
Portage	0.63	0.34	0.01	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.64
Texas Tech	0.70	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.72
Region VII	0.49	0.49	0.01	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.48
U. of Denver	0.59	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.59
Los Angeles	0.51	0.42	0.06	0.01	0.00	1.00	3.44
Pacific	0.57	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.58
PSU	0.62	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.62
Alaska	0.42	0.56	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.40
ALL RAPS:	0.55	0.41	0.02	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.53

*Average "grade" computed on the usual 4.0 system, as weighted above, with "no answer" cases excluded. "No answers" are included, however, in the proportions showing the distribution of trainees giving each response.

TABLE 3.13: WORKSHOP TOPICS CITED BY TRAINING CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS, BY RAP
(Note: Proportions cited--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, e.g., 73%. Totals add to well over 1.0 (100%) due to multiple responses.)

RAP:	Percent Citing Attendance in Workshops on:																				Average Number of Topics Cited:
	Screening	Assessment	Diagnosis	Mainstreaming:	Planning for Each Child:	Developing IEP's, etc.	Supervision of HC Efforts	Curriculum Techniques:	Work with Public Schools	Component Coordination	Work with Families	Attitudes toward the HC	Behavior Management	Gifted HC Children	Abuse/Neglect of the HC	Severely HC Children	Serve HC in Day Care	Specific HC Conditions*	Other Topics	No Answer	
N Engl	0.33	0.42	0.36	0.70	0.39	0.05	0.25	0.64	0.07	0.06	0.60	0.75	0.19	0.24	0.02	0.39	0.22	0.37	0.11	0.02	6.17
NYU	0.28	0.28	0.35	0.79	0.43	0.29	0.20	0.44	0.28	0.23	0.71	0.78	0.22	0.23	0.12	0.27	0.42	0.39	0.11	0.00	6.84
Reg III	0.42	0.37	0.24	0.42	0.34	0.12	0.16	0.34	0.08	0.07	0.39	0.41	0.45	0.09	0.20	0.22	0.26	0.15	0.16	0.02	4.91
C. Hill	0.44	0.36	0.29	0.59	0.69	0.22	0.22	0.47	0.10	0.07	0.34	0.42	0.32	0.37	0.65	0.29	0.30	0.32	0.11	0.01	6.57
Nashv	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.50	0.40	0.13	0.28	0.36	0.07	0.10	0.45	0.48	0.30	0.21	0.05	0.25	0.35	0.28	0.12	0.05	4.84
Miss	0.45	0.41	0.57	0.94	0.55	0.55	0.46	0.63	0.41	0.32	0.71	0.61	0.65	0.18	0.70	0.50	0.47	0.82	0.49	0.01	10.43
U/Ill	0.23	0.42	0.23	0.37	0.34	0.35	0.13	0.25	0.22	0.08	0.39	0.39	0.21	0.12	0.23	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.04	4.39
Portage	0.10	0.20	0.23	0.54	0.33	0.11	0.22	0.37	0.20	0.18	0.37	0.37	0.65	0.30	0.27	0.18	0.16	0.08	0.31	0.04	5.20
Texas T	0.83	0.81	0.63	0.91	0.48	0.70	0.41	0.38	0.21	0.27	0.73	0.72	0.30	0.25	0.21	0.49	0.43	0.32	0.04	0.01	9.14
R VII	0.18	0.33	0.05	0.77	0.63	0.30	0.33	0.64	0.05	0.05	0.81	0.59	0.42	0.25	0.03	0.55	0 56	0.55	0.07	0.00	7.16
U/Denv	0.75	0.55	0.34	0.69	0.47	0.20	0.41	0.53	0.17	0.20	0.67	0.81	0.36	0.19	0.13	0.52	0.16	0.28	0.03	0.00	7.45
Los Ang	0.17	0.31	0.24	0.46	0.45	0.21	0.14	0.34	0.03	0.16	0.42	0.30	0.71	0.11	0.29	0.19	0.09	0.10	0.04	0.01	4.74
Pacific	0.61	0.63	0.59	0.54	0.65	0.13	0.20	0.15	0.02	0.11	0.70	0.30	0.13	0.09	0.13	0.15	0.00	0.61	0.43	0.04	6.22
PSU	0.45	0.57	0.37	0.43	0.52	0.37	0.10	0 52	0.18	0.22	0.57	0.32	0.55	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.25	0.27	0.13	0.03	6.37
Alaska	0.14	0.20	0.10	0.62	0.40	0.10	0.10	0.32	0.06	0.12	0.22	0.32	0.46	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.18	0.02	3.82
All:	0.32	0.35	0.31	0.64	0.45	0.26	0.23	0.43	0.17	0.16	0.55	0.54	0.39	0.20	0.23	0.28	0.29	0.32	0.16	0.02	6.31

*See the following table for details of specific handicapping conditions cited by the respondents. Proportions based on total of 1953 cases.

No two RAPs show similar response patterns when these workshop citations are examined. The differences are caused by many factors, including variations in the variety of workshops offered at different conferences, differences in grantee needs assessments, and past variations from one RAP to the next in historical service emphases and regional program preferences. The following summaries take only the grossest distinctions into account:

- New England trainees are less prone than most to cite workshops in child abuse and neglect, developing IEP's, working with public schools, intercomponent coordination, and behavior management; they are more likely than most to mention sessions in curriculum techniques and attitudes toward the handicapped.

- NYU's conference participants are less likely than most to mention behavior management, and more likely than most to cite workshops on attitudes towards the handicapped, working with families of handicapped children, and mainstreaming.

- Region III trainees choose fewer topics, in general, than most; they are especially less prone to cite workshops in mainsreaming, developing IEP's or IPP's, working with public schools, intercomponent coordination, and working with gifted handicapped children.

- Chapel Hill's conference participants are less likely than others to mention the coordination of components of the Head Start effort, and more likely than most to cite planning for each child, working with gifted children, and child abuse/neglect.

- Nashville participants generally cite fewer types of workshops, and are particularly unlikely to mention screening, assessment, diagnosis, developing IEP's, working with public schools, or child abuse and neglect.

- Mississippi trainees mention more than ten different workshop topics, on the average. They cite all topics more than most of the mainstreaming conference participants, save only workshops on gifted children. They are especially prone to mention mainstreaming itself as a topic (94 percent), and specific handicapping conditions (82 percent).

- Trainees at the University of Illinois's conferences generally cite fewer topics than most; this is particularly the case with mentions of workshops on mainstreaming, serving severely handicapped children, serving handiicapped children in day care settings, and sessions on specific handicap conditions.

- Portage conference participants are less likely than others to mention workshops on screening, developing IEP's, and specific kinds of handicap conditions; they are more likely than most to cite sessions on behavior management.

- Texas Tech's trainees, like those at Mississippi, are also likely to cite more workshop topics than the typical RAP. They are

especially prone to mention sessions on screening, assessment, diagnosis, mainstreaming itself, developing IEP's, supervising the handicap service effort, working with families, attitudes toward the handicapped, and severely handicapped children. They are less likely than others to mention "other" topics not specified in the list provided in RLA's questionnaire.

- The Region VII RAP's conference participants are less likely than others to mention screening, diagnosis, working with public schools, innercomponent coordination, child abuse and neglect, and "others." They are more prone to cite planning for each child, curriculum techniques, working with families, severely handicapped children, working in day care settings, and specific handicapping conditions.

- Denver trainees are more likely than most to cite workshops on screening, assessment, supervision, attitudes toward the handicapped, and severely handicapped children. They are less likely than most to mention "other" topics.

- Trainees at the Los Angeles RAP's conferences cite fewer topics in general than most, and are particularly unlikely to mention workshops on screening, mainstreaming, working with public schools, attitudes toward the handicapped, gifted children, day care setting, specific handicapping conditions, and "other" topics; they are more likely than most to mention sessions on behavior management.

- Pacific trainees are less prone than most to cite workshops on IEP's, curriculum techniques, working with public schools, attitudes toward the handicapped, behavior management, gifted children, or day care settings. They are more likely than others to mention sessions on screening, assessment, diagnosis, planning for each child, working with families, specific handicapping conditions, and "others."

- Portland State University's conference participants are less prone than others to cite mainstreaming, supervision, or attitudes toward the handicapped as workshop topics. They are more likely than others to mention assessment.

- Alaska's trainees cite the smallest number of workshops. They are less likely than most to mention all of the topics, save only behavior management and the "others."

A picture of general overall consistency with mainstreaming conference data for earlier years is also presented by the distribution of specific handicapping conditions cited by the trainees. Table 3.14 provides the proportions mentioning particular conditions, based on those reporting attendance for any workshop on such conditions. The results for the network in general are similar to those for 1982-83. The general tendency to mention sessions on the deaf and hearing impaired and on speech impairments has gone down, compared to the previous year; the propensity to mention physical impairments (called "orthopedic handicaps" by most trainees) and health impairments has gone up, as has the share of trainees who said they attended workshops on particular handicapping conditions but who then did not specify any particular condition as a topic. Again, outcomes on a RAP-by-RAP basis vary widely.

TABLE 3.14: TOPICS CITED, CONTINUED: WORKSHOPS CITED ON SPECIFIC HANDICAPS, BY RAP*

RAP:	Blind/ Visually Impaired	Deaf/ Hearing Impaired	Speech Impaired	Emotion- ally Disturbed	Physic- ally Impaired	Health Impaired	Learning Disabled	Mentally Retarded	Handicap not Spe- cified	Average No. HCs Cited
New England	0.05	0.08	0.28	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.30	0.13	0.43	1.40
NYU	0.18	0.23	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.45	0.01	0.05	0.32	1 34
Region III	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.24	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.59	1.00
Chapel Hill	0.14	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.34	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.51	1.20
Nashville	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.26	0.04	0.46	1.11
Mississippi	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.52	0.06	0.36	0.69	0.10	0.07	1.98
U. of Illinois	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.33	0.17	0.33	1.08
Portage	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.54	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.31	1.23
Texas Tech	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.77	1.08
Region VII	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	1.43
U. of Denver	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.33	0.22	0.11	0.06	0.28	1.56
Los Angeles	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.50	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.45	1.15
Pacific	0.46	0.50	0.39	0.32	0.36	0.32	0.43	0.21	0.36	3.36
PSU	0.06	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.13	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.19
Alaska	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	1.00
ALL RAPS	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.15	0.24	0.21	0.07	0.34	1.51

*Note: Proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 (100%) due to multiple answers. Warning: in this table, unlike others, proportions are based on the total number of trainees citing any specific handicaps as training topics, and measure the relative propensity for particular disabilities to be those cited. For a measure of the general propensity to report any handicapping condition as a workshop topic, see Table 3.13,Column 18. These conventions are consistent with those employed in the RAP evaluation in past years.

It seems possible that restriction of the study samples to two conferences per RAP could have resulted in some exaggeration of these distinctions; if all conferences had been included, the range of handicapping conditions cited might be more comparable from one RAP to the next. The same may be true of the more general workshop topics mentioned by trainees, discussed earlier.

Changes Resulting from the Training

The next question asked participants is "What will you do differently after this training?". The average number of changes anticipated by respondents is 3.29; in 1982-83 it was 3.35. For the network as a whole, the most common expected change is "observe more closely," cited by 64 percent of the trainees; the next most common responses are "use new resources and materials" (49 percent); "use new ways with handicapped children" (48 percent); "work more closely with other staff" (40 percent); "work more closely with families" (39 percent); "plan for each child" (29 percent); "use the Head Start mainstreaming manuals" (28 percent); and "develop IEP's" (17 percent). Six percent of the trainees mention other changes, and five percent say they do not expect changes in their practices. All of these statistics are very similar to those obtained in 1982-83 (the largest discrepancy is only five percent); moreover, the rank ordering of the responses is unchanged from the previous year. Results are provided in Table 3.15.

Even the RAP-by-RAP variations are remarkably similar to those for 1982-83. The most noticable difference between results for the two years is a drop in the average number of expected changes mentioned by trainees at the Alaska RAP's conferences, from 3.54 in 1982-83 to 2.46 in 1983-84. Other notable variations among individual RAPs:

- Mississippi trainees cite more expected changes than any others; the same applied to this RAP in 1982-83.
- Texas Tech's trainees are more likely than most to mention use of the Head Start manuals.
- Denver conferences participants are especially likely to say that they expect to be observing more closely.
- Pacific trainees seem especially prone to expect to plan for each child, use IEP's, work more closely with families of handicapped children, and make "other" changes (those not specified in the original evaluation questionnaire).

In previous years, a separate small-scale follow-up survey was conducted by RLA to verify these anticipated changes. The validation studies have consistently confirmed that the trainees do put changes into practice as a result of RAP mainstreaming training. Some expected differences in practices do not come to pass, but these are balanced by other changes reported by trainees which they did not anticipate but which they do attribute to their mainstreaming training. Because the results of the validation studies have been so consistent over the years, they were not repeated in 1983-84.

"Unexpected Conditions" and Other Problems

The trainees' evaluation forms include two questions designed to surface problems in the mainstreaming training. One item deals with difficulties with equipment, facilities, etc., while the other deals with the planning, content, and presentation of the training itself. Results are provided in Tables 3.16 and 3.17.

TABLE 3.15: WHAT TRAINEES EXPECT TO DO DIFFERENTLY AFTER THEIR TRAINING, BY RAP
(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 due to multiple responses)

	Use New Ways w/ Children	Observe More Closely	Plan For Each Child	Develop IEP,IPP (etc)	Work Closely w/ Family	Work Closely w/ O/Staff	Use New Mater'l	Use H.S. Manuals	Other Changes	No Expected Changes	No Answer	Average No. of Changes
New England	0.50	0.68	0.21	0.06	0.33	0.40	0.58	0.28	0.07	0.04	0.06	3.22
NYU	0.52	0.61	0.20	0.17	0.51	0.55	0.59	0.30	0.07	0.03	0.03	3.59
Region III	0.47	0.57	0.27	0.07	0.28	0.22	0.36	0.20	0.04	0.04	0.04	2.57
Chapel Hill	0.50	0.70	0.41	0.11	0.32	0.42	0.54	0.31	0.04	0.05	0.01	3.40
Nashville	0.50	0.56	0.22	0.06	0.35	0.32	0.44	0.18	0.00	0.07	0.05	2.76
Mississippi	0.68	0.84	0.62	0.47	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.78	0.10	0.01	0.03	5.38
U. of Illinois	0.33	0.51	0.18	0.24	0.34	0.29	0.34	0.09	0.03	0.08	0.03	2.47
Portage	0.34	0.54	0.23	0.09	0.18	0.23	0.47	0.13	0.14	0.09	0.05	2.50
Texas Tech	0.60	0.73	0.40	0.31	0.51	0.46	0.58	0.48	0.00	0.07	0.04	4.17
Region VII	0.44	0.59	0.19	0.15	0.42	0.26	0.34	0.19	0.00	0.12	0.08	2.79
U. of Denver	0.50	0.78	0.30	0.03	0.38	0.38	0.53	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.02	3.14
Los Angeles	0.40	0.68	0.31	0.14	0.29	0.35	0.34	0.25	0.05	0.05	0.02	2.86
Pacific	0.54	0.59	0.54	0.41	0.59	0.52	0.37	0.20	0.22	0.07	0.09	4.13
PSU	0.53	0.72	0.42	0.20	0.32	0.38	0.53	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.07	3.37
Alaska	0.26	0.52	0.24	0.06	0.16	0.24	0.46	0.24	0.00	0.12	0.16	2.46
ALL RAPS:	0.48	0.64	0.29	0.17	0.39	0.40	0.49	0.28	0.06	0.05	0.04	3.29

TABLE 3.16: UNEXPECTED CONDITIONS THAT AFFECTED THE TRAINING CONFERENCES, BY RAP
(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 = percents, e.g. 73%. Totals include multiple responses.)

RAP:	No Unexpected Conditions:	Yes: unexpected conditions				Average Number of Conditions Cited:	Proportion Citing Any Condition	No Response to Item
		Equipment Not Working	Poor Facility	Room Temperature	Other Circumstances			
New England	0.75	0.04	0.11	0.13	0.00	0.28	0.23	0.02
NYU	0.62	0.04	0.16	0.21	0.04	0.47	0.34	0.04
Region III	0.73	0.04	0.08	0.09	0.02	0.24	0.22	0.05
Chapel Hill	0.75	0.04	0.04	0.21	0.01	0.29	0.24	0.01
Nashville	0.87	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.08
Mississippi	0.51	0.02	0.04	0.22	0.20	0.52	0.41	0.08
U. of Illinois	0.50	0.08	0.07	0.34	0.02	0.54	0.43	0.07
Portage	0.85	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.11	0.11	0.04
Texas Tech	0.83	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.00	0.11	0.10	0.07
Region VII	0.81	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.18	0.01
U. of Denver	0.70	0.13	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.28	0.25	0.05
Los Angeles	0.81	0.02	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.16	0.15	0.04
Pacific	0.76	0.04	0.15	0.04	0.02	0.27	0.22	0.02
PSU	0.68	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.22	0.33	0.27	0.05
Alaska	0.76	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.10	0.25	0.04	0.20
ALL RAPS	0.71	0.04	0.06	0.14	0.05	0.30	0.24	0.05

TABLE 3.17: OTHER PROBLEMS THAT AFFECTED THE TRAINING CONFERENCES, BY RAP

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 (100%) due to multiple answers)

RAP:	No Problems:	Yes: problems include:						Average Number of Problems Cited:	Proportion Citing Any Problem	No Response to Item
		Poorly Planned	Too General	Content Too Simple	Content Too Difficult	Not What Trainee Expected	Other Problem			
New England	0.81	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.17	0.16	0.04
NYU	0.82	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.18	0.15	0.03
Region III	0.85	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.13	0.09	0.05
Chapel Hill	0.90	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.10	0.08	0.02
Nashville	0.88	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.08
Mississippi	0.90	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07
U. of Illinois	0.69	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.32	0.25	0.06
Portage	0.80	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.15	0.14	0.06
Texas Tech	0.90	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.06
Region VII	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03
U. of Denver	0.88	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.03
Los Angeles	0.81	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.21	0.16	0.04
Pacific	0.63	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.17	0.41	0.33	0.04
PSU	0.77	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.17	0.13	0.10
Alaska	0.76	0.00	0.10	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.02	0.28	0.02	0.22
ALL RAPS	0.83	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.15	0.12	0.05

TABLE 3.18: SUGGESTIONS FROM CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS FOR NEXT YEAR'S RAP MAINSTREAMING TRAINING
(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 [100%], due to multiple responses).

RAP:	Proportions suggesting training in such Mainstreaming Topics as:											Average Number of Suggestions
	IEP's, IPP's, etc.	Behavior Management	Working w/Public Schools	Child Abuse/ Neglect	Working w/severe HCs	Working w/families	Supervisor's Training	Serve in Day Care	Other HC Condit'n	Other Suggestions	No Answer	
New England	0.25	0.53	0.29	0.38	0.30	0.35	0.25	0.29	0.08	0.10	0.07	3.05
NYU	0.24	0.41	0.38	0.51	0.18	0.42	0.26	0.24	0.05	0.05	0.06	2.88
Region III	0.24	0.49	0.14	0.33	0.16	0.32	0.21	0.17	0.06	0.02	0.16	2.38
Chapel Hill	0.30	0.44	0.26	0.43	0.24	0.43	0.29	0.34	0.04	0.03	0.02	2.89
Nashville	0.18	0.42	0.20	0.35	0.27	0.31	0.23	0.20	0.03	0.02	0.15	2.43
Mississippi	0.26	0.60	0.34	0.64	0.39	0.43	0.43	0.20	0.03	0.07	0.08	3.52
U. of Illinois	0.16	0.36	0.19	0.25	0.16	0.23	0.22	0.12	0.03	0.01	0.07	1.82
Portage	0.28	0.67	0.41	0.61	0.27	0.57	0.48	0.22	0.04	0.09	0.16	3.90
Texas Tech	0.30	0.47	0.24	0.46	0.22	0.26	0.45	0.26	0.05	0.01	0.07	2.91
Region VII	0.10	0.52	0.23	0.33	0.13	0.30	0.13	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.22	2.12
U. of Denver	0.21	0.51	0.28	0.53	0.14	0.39	0.25	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.12	2.51
Los Angeles	0.26	0.46	0.21	0.25	0.18	0.40	0.28	0.14	0.03	0.03	0.11	2.39
Pacific	0.30	0.32	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.64	0.27	0.00	0.07	0.30	0.05	2.55
PSU	0.09	0.51	0.49	0.24	0.18	0.53	0.35	0.18	0.03	0.11	0.09	2.85
Alaska	0.24	0.45	0.38	0.48	0.31	0.41	0.41	0.21	0.02	0.00	0.22	3.69
ALL RAPS:	0.23	0.47	0.29	0.42	0.22	0.39	0.29	0.20	0.04	0.05	0.10	2.76

The proportion of trainees reporting "unexpected conditions" dropped from 34 percent in 1982-83 to 24 percent in 1983-84. Only trainees from the NYU, Mississippi, and University of Illinois RAPs were especially prone to report these problems of facilities or circumstances; participants at conferences sponsored by these same three RAPs were also more likely than any others to cite more than one problem. The most frequently cited problem was room temperature, mentioned by over a third of the Illinois trainees, by 22 percent of the Mississippi respondents, by 21 percent of the NYU and Chapel Hill participants, and by 18 percent of the Region VII trainees. Over a fifth of the Mississippi and Portland State trainees also cited "other" miscellaneous problems, including problems with bad weather, the inability to hear what was going on, smoking despite requests not to do so, and various difficulties with conference sites. A number of the Portland trainees mentioned a bomb scare.

Problems with the RAPs' conduct of the mainstreaming conferences were even less common than those with equipment and facilities. Overall results for the network were virtually identical to those reported in 1982-83, with 83 percent of the trainees reporting no problems with the conduct of the sessions. Even RAP-by-RAP results are very close to those for the previous year, in most cases; the Portland State, Alaska, and Texas Tech RAPs had fewer problems mentioned than in 1982-83, while the trainees served by the Pacific RAP became more prone to cite problems, especially that the training seemed too general. The same complaint was also voiced by ten percent of the Alaska trainees. Trainees participating in the University of Illinois' conferences were also relatively likely to report problems with the conduct of the training.

The most common "other" conference problem mentioned by traines was "not enough time." Another problem often mentioned by those using the "other" category was the inability to be able to attend a desired workshop session, due to limitations on enrollment, schedule conflicts, cancellations, or other reasons.

Suggestions for Next Year

Invited to make suggestions for the 1984-85 RAP program year, 90 percent of the trainees did so (see Table 3.18). Once again, overall results closely resemble those obtained in 1982-83. Future sessions on behavior management, child abuse and neglect, and sessions on working with families of the handicapped remain the favorite recommendations of the participants. Workshops on specific handicapping conditions or on miscellaneous "other" topics continue to be suggested by less than ten percent of the trainees. A few RAP-by-RAP variations are evident. Significant numbers of NYU trainees also favor training on working with public schools. Mississippi trainees indicate some interest in sessions on supervision of the handicap effort and on working with the severely handicapped child. Portage trainees show interest in supervisory training and sessions on working with the schools; Texas Tech trainees are also fairly interested in the supervisory training. Portland State's conference participants show interest in sessions on working with the schools.

Summary

On the whole, the strong record achieved by the network for its mainstreaming training in 1982-83 has been maintained and refined in 1983-84. The ratings for the conferences sponsored by the University of Illinois RAP are weaker than those for other RAPs; the general ratings are still good ones but plainly this is an area worth further study by that RAP. All the RAPs seem to perform adequately in providing mainstreaming training, and many appear to be outstanding in their conduct of this work. The trainees at the Mississippi and Texas Tech RAPs seem to be reacting especially well to their training conferences.

Facilitate Collaborative Agreements

A task of major importance for all members of the RAP network is promoting cooperation between Head Start and agencies serving young children with handicaps. By contract, each RAP is required to:

- Take the role of facilitator in promoting formal written agreements between each State Education Agency in their service area and Head Start grantees.
- Where a state agreement exists or where circumstances warrant, the contractor should move to facilitate and assist in the implementation of agreements between local education agencies and Head Start programs.

ACYF's expectations for collaboration between Head Start and public schools, and RAPs' role in the process, stems from a cooperative interagency agreement signed by ACYF and the Office of Education in 1978. Earlier, Public Law 94-142, the Education of the Handicapped Act, had passed in 1975, mandating cooperation among public agencies and setting the tone for both parties.

How RAPs proceed with the often difficult and slow task of promoting collaboration is an individual project's choice, based on the skills and experience of the RAP staff and the disposition of state and local agencies toward specifying exchanges of services in writing. The number of states within a RAP's catchment area may also affect the approach of a RAP to this task; states or territories within these domains range from one in Mississippi and Alaska, to six in New England, Region III, and Denver; the Pacific RAP has seven areas. Most other RAPs average three states.

In addition to promoting shared services with public school systems, RAPs work with other agencies and organizations to provide improved services to young children with handicaps. This chapter will present the undertakings of the RAP network to meet the objectives of the task through: 1) collaboration with State Education Agencies (SEAs); 2) collaboration with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and 3) collaboration with other agencies serving young handicapped children.

Collaboration with State Education Agencies

Because the directive to work with State Education Agencies has been emphasized by ACYF, the evaluation includes a telephone survey of SEA personnel and their counterparts in U.S. Territories. The survey was designed to portray in detail the professional exchanges between RAPs and SEAs, inquiring into the nature of contact, frequency of communications, satisfaction of SEAs with RAP services, problems, suggestions for improvement, and services which SEAs identify as most valuable. Table 3.19, Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction, 1983-1984, presents the findings from this year's survey.

SEA Sample Size

Every SEA or territorial counterpart that has a Head Start grantee within its geographical jurisdiction is included in the survey. In 1983-84 evaluators contacted 59 respondents: 50 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, Ponape, the Marshall Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Mariana Islands, and the

Table 3.19

Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction
1983-1984

CHARACTERISTICS	NE	NYU	R III	CH	NASH	MS	UofI	PP	TT	UK	DENVER	LA	PACIF	PSU	AK	NATIONAL	
Number of Cases	5	4	6	4	3	1	3	3	5	4	6	3	6	3	1	57	
Frequency Index 4 = more than monthly; 3 = monthly; 2 = occasionally (6-11 x/yr); 1 = infrequency (1-5 x/yr); 0 = never	2.8	1.3	2.5	3.5	2.7	1.0	4.0	3.7	2.0	2.5	2.6	3.0	3.5	2.0	4.0	2.7	
Initiator of Contacts (Number of SEAs)																# SEA	% SEA
Mutual	4	1	5	3	2	1	3	2	2	3	4	1	2	2	1	36	63
RAP	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	3	-	2	2	3	-	-	15	26
SEA	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	4	7
No contact	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4
Nature of Contacts(# of SEAs)(Unprompted)																# SEA	% SEA
Advisory committee	4	2	1	3	3	1	3	3	-	3	1	2	3	-	1	30	53
Meetings, Workshop conferences	2	1	1	4	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	2	5	-	-	26	46
Materials	1	2	5	3	2	-	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	-	28	49
SEA/HS agreements	1	1	3	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	3	1	1	19	33
LEA/HS agreements	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	12
SEA used as provider	2	2	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	10	18
RAP used as provider	2	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	12	21
Information exchange	5	2	6	3	3	1	3	3	5	4	5	3	6	2	1	52	91
Mutual project	4	-	3	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	21	37
SIG	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	8	14
Other	4	2	3	1	1	-	3	1	1	3	-	1	2	4	-	26	46
Introductory contact	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
None	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4
Average No. of Types of contact per state	5.6	3.3	4.2	6.0	5.3	2.0	6.0	5.0	2.6	4.3	2.6	3.7	3.8	4.7	5.0	4.2	
Satisfaction Grade Excellent (4.0); Good (3.0-3.9); Fair (2.0-2.9); Poor (1.0-1.9)	3.7	2.3	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8	2.8	2.5	3.6	2.9	3.0	2.8	4.0	3.3	
Suggestions	5	1	3	3	-	1	1	4	3	3	2	2	4	1	-	33	

Confederated States of Micronesia. Interviews were conducted with all but three respondents (Vermont and the Marshall Islands, whose positions were vacant, and Palau, whose respondent could not be reached after numerous attempts).

Nature of Contacts

Additional summary data on trends over time in these SEA surveys is provided in Table 3.20, National Profile of RAP/SEA Interactions, 1981-1984. On the average, the SEAs cited 4.2 types of contacts with RAP in 1983-84. The number of types of contacts has remained at a constant level for four years. The distribution of the services by type, remains relatively stable, as well. The exception this year is a major dimunition in attendance or presentations at each other's meetings, a shift from 70 percent last year to 46 percent in 1983-1984. There has been a moderate increase in projects mutually undertaken by RAPs and SEAs, up from 25 percent to 37 percent this year, and increased assistance by RAPs in the process of developing State Implementation Grants (SIG's; from six percent in 1982-83 to 14 percent in 1983-84). Only two respondents (Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) had had no contact with RAP. All others, whether veterans of their agencies or newly hired, could identify some kind of exchange with RAP.

Those RAPs whose SEAs cited the highest number of different kinds of contacts were Chapel Hill (6.0), the University of Illinois (6.0), and New England (5.6). The fewest citations were given by SEAs in the Mississippi (2.0), Texas Tech (2.6), and Denver (2.6) RAPs' service areas. For Mississippi, with only one SEA to work with, RAP contact has been limited to meetings and telephone exchanges. Texas Tech has five SEAs with which to maintain contact. In one of the states, Louisiana, there have been numerous and frequent exchanges. The other states acknowledge less frequent contact with RAP. In the Denver RAP's service area, two of the six informants were new to their positions. All others ranged between 3 and 5 types of contacts.

Almost every respondent (91%) identified exchanges of information, most commonly by phone, as a type of contact with the RAP. More than half also indicated mail and meetings as a common exchange. The types of information transferred typically included newsletters, notifications of training, lists of Head Start programs, reports, exchanges of progress reports, updates on Head Start policy, computer data, or just staying in touch.

The next most frequently mentioned type of contact was participation on a RAP advisory committee. About half (53%) of the respondents attended these meetings and another 16 percent noted that they were invited, but unable to attend. Comments from Ohio, Delaware, North Carolina, Nebraska, and Indiana suggest that the opportunity to attend the RAP advisory committee meetings provided a rare opportunity for SEA staff to meet their counterparts from other states and discuss important regional issues. As the North Carolina representative relates, "The advisory committee is not so much advisors to RAP as a help to SEAs. It gives us an opportunity to share and meet colleagues. I liked the Georgia agreement so much, we are looking at it to revise ours."

Roughly half (49%) of the informants recalled receiving materials from RAP, such as manuals for serving children with handicapping conditions, New Friends dolls, child abuse prevention training materials, Head Start public relations materials, samples of SEA/Head Start agreements, and activities for use in the classroom. The Minnesota respondent complimented RAP's "superb" materials and added, "Where there are no materials, RAP develops them."

Table 3.20

National Profile of RAP/SEA Interactions
1981-1984

CHARACTERISTICS	1984 (N=56)	1983 (N=53)	1982 (N=51)	1981 (N=53)
Frequency of Contact:				
4=More than monthly	35 %	28 %	29 %	26 %
3=Monthly	19	30	18	26
2=Occasionally (6-11 x/yr)	26	28	33	21
1=Infrequently (1-5 x/yr)	16	9	10	19
0=Never	4	4	8	8
Frequency Index	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.5
Initiation of Contact:				
Mutual	63	66	63	74
RAP	26	30	25	17
SEA	7	0	0	2
No initiation	4	4	12	8
Nature of Contacts:				
Advisory Committee	53 %	60 %	53 %	62 %
Meetings, Workshops	46	70	73	64
Materials	49	40	43	36
SEA/HS agreements	33	28	37	42
LEA/HS agreements	12	15	14	9
SEA used as provider	18	9	20	8
RAP used as provider	21	32	16	26
Information exchange	91	91	82	85
Mutual project	37	25	22	9
State plan	0	0	2	0
SIG	14	6	2	4
Other	46	34	33	8
Introductory contact	2	2	8	17
None	4	4	8	8
Average No. Types of Contact	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.9
Satisfaction:				
Excellent (4.0)	49 %	53 %	47 %	45 %
Good (3.0 - 3.9)	26	34	39	34
Fair (2.0 - 2.9)	12	2	4	2
Poor (1.0 - 1.9)	0	0	0	2
No opinion (1.0)	9	6	8	6
Opinion Excluded	4	6	2	11
National "Grade"	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.4
Problems encountered in dealing with RAP;				
No	91 %	98 %	98 %	89 %
Yes	5	2	2	11
Don't know	4	0	0	0

As mentioned previously, there has been a decrease in the attendance at meetings, workshops, and conferences. Notwithstanding, 46 percent of all SEAs did attend some kind of a RAP function (excluding advisory committee meetings) or vice versa. The Mississippi, PSU and Alaska RAPs are the only ones whose SEA representatives did not mention this type of contact. Often RAP or SEA staff provided training for the other's conferences. In Wisconsin, California, Connecticut, Nebraska, Hawaii, Maryland, Georgia, Alabama, Nevada, Illinois, Louisiana and Ponape, either the RAP trained public school staff, or the SEA trained Head Start staff, or both. Some of the topics mentioned were serving critically ill children (New Hampshire), New Friends (Massachusetts), petitioning procedures for family courts (New York), overview of preschool law (Pennsylvania), Talking Between the Lines (Georgia), severe handicapping conditions (Michigan), questions and answers on collaboration ("innesota), and an SEA/Head Start collaborative agreement (Hawaii).

Mutual projects are productive and visible joint efforts undertaken by RAPs and SEAs. Thirty-seven percent of all SEAs described some kind of project of this nature. The substance of these endeavors suggest commitment to one another's tasks and usually a good deal of hard work to carry out the effort. In all, there were 38 mutual projects, which are very briefly described below:

New England
- In Connecticut, RAP facilitated the development of a Preschool Incentive Grant (PIG) with the SEA, whereby a sum of money has been committed for a team of special education staff and Head Start handicap coordinators to combine forces to foster good early childhood practices. ACYF/Region I has been invited to fund a position on this team.
- RAP and the Connecticut SEA sponsored a conference for LEA, Head Start, ACYF Regional Office, RAP, and SEA staffs to discuss an effort to encourage local service agreements through state-level SEA/Head Start interagency teams.
- RAP and the SEA in Massachusetts established a task force to meet monthly for the purpose of revising that state's agreement with Head Start.
- In Maine, RAP and the SEA conducted a survey on services to preschool age handicapped children.
- New Hampshire's SEA and RAP reviewed data on numbers of handicapped children in the state for the purpose of reducing discrepancies in the findings.

Region III
- The District of Columbia agreed to be a pilot site for the child abuse and neglect prevention project, and RAP conducted a six-week workshop.
- RAP and the SEA in Maryland have met to develop a plan of action to operationalize the objectives in Maryland's long-standing statement of intent.

-Virginia's SEA enlisted RAP's assistance to review a model for mainstreaming handicapped children in the public schools.

Chapel Hill -The SEA in Georgia and RAP co-sponsored two workshops for public school and Head Start personnel, to explain the new state agreement.

Nashville -RAP, the Alabama SEA, the Crippled Children's Society, university providers, Head Start, mental health representatives, and Department of Pensions and Security staff all participated on a state advisory committee to improve services for young handicapped children.

Portage -In Wisconsin, RAP, the Handicap Advocate and the SEA sponsored a workshop on the transition of children from Head Start to public school.

Texas Tech -RAP helped with the Louisiana SEA's special project to establish joint placements for handicapped children in six sites.

Region VII -RAP has been selected to participate on a Kansas sub-committee on early childhood development services.

-The Nebraska SEA and RAP co-sponsored their fifth Annual Conference.

Los Angeles -The SEA in California and RAP are working co-operatively on the development of an early childhood special education credential for teachers.

Pacific -Under a Preschool Incentive Grant (PIG), the state of Hawaii and RAP provided joint training for Head Start and public school teachers.

PSU -RAP and the Oregon SEA have met together to develop guidelines for Head Start programs that conform to those of the state regarding services to handicapped children and transition to public schools.

Alaska -RAP and the SEA sit on a Head Start advisory committee.

No special projects were mentioned this year by respondents served by the NYU, Mississippi, University of Illinois, or Denver RAPs.

During the 1983-1984 program year, new SEA agreements have been finalized in the District of Columbia, Georgia, Oregon, and Alaska, bringing the total number to 40 written collaborative agreements between Head Start and State Education Agencies. (Tables 3.21, Existing SEA/Head Start Agreements As Reported by RAPs, 1984 and 3.22, Abbreviated Contents of SEA/Head Start Collaborative Agreements, later in this section contain the titles and signers of agreements, and contents of the agreements in

Table 3.21

Existing SEA/Head Start Agreements As Reported By RAPs, 1984

		Title of Agreement	Signing Parties
Region I	CT	Interagency Agreement between the Connecticut Department of Education and Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Commissioner, Department of Education ACYF[1]
	MA	Interagency Agreement between the Massachusetts Department of Education and the Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Commissioner, Department of Education ACYF
Region II	NJ	Agreement for Services 1980-81	Issued by the Interdepartment Committee for Education to the Handicapped
	NY	Memorandum of Mutual Understanding	Executive Deputy Commissioner, State Education Department ACYF
	PR	Cooperative Interagency Agreement for the Delivery of Services to Handicapped Children	Department of Social Services Department of Labor Department of Services Against Addiction Department of Housing Department of Public Education
	VI	Interagency Agreement	Commissioner of Education Virgin Islands Community Action Agency
Region III	DE	Statement of Agreement of Collaboration between Delaware Head Start Programs and the Delaware Department of Public Instruction, Exceptional Children/Special Programs Divisions	State Director, Exceptional Children/Special Programs ACYF
	MD	Signed Statement of Intent	Liaison, State Department of Education Head Start Training Officer
	DC	Statement of Agreement of Collaboration between UPO Head Start Programs and the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services D.C. Public Schools	UPO Head Start District of Columbia Public Schools
Region IV	FL	An Agreement between the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Education on Behalf of Handicapped Children in Head Start Programs	Commissioner, Department of Education Secretary, Department of Community Affairs
	NC	Cooperative Agreement between North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction/Division for Exceptional Children and Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
	GA	Cooperative Agreement between the Georgia Department of Education Office of Instructional Services Division of Special Programs and the Georgia Head Start Programs	State Superintendent of Schools ACYF
	KY	Joint Memorandum of Agreement Between Kentucky Department of Education and Kentucky Head Start Network (Represented by and under Region IV ACYF)	Superintendent of Public Instruction, Departme of Education ACYF
	MS	Agreement Between Mississippi State Department of Education and Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Region IV	Mississippi State Superintendent of Education ACYF
Region V	IL	Memorandum re Current Relationship between Public Schools and Head Start Programs In The Delivery of Comprhensive Services to Three through Five Year Old Children with Handicaps (Updated 8/81)	State Superintendent of Education Chairperson, Illinois Association of Head Start Directors
	OH	Memorandum of Agreement between Ohio Division of Special Education and Ohio Head Start Handicap Services Advocate (Updated 12/80)	Director, Division of Special Education Ohio Head Start Handicap Services Advocate
	MN	Joint Statement of Policy between the Minnesota State Department of Education and Head Start Programs in Minnesota	Commissioner of Education ACYF
	MI	Joint Statement of Agreement between Special Education Services Area of the Michigan Department of Education and Region V ACYF and Michigan Head Start Association	Director, Special Education, Department of Education ACYF Minnesota Head Start Association
	WI	Joint Statement of Agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and Head Start in Wisconsin	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
Region VI	LA	An Agreement Concerning the Implementation of Act 754 of Louisiana Legislature of 1977	Superintendent, State Department of Education ACYF
	OK	Letter of Agreement between the Special Education Section Oklahoma State Department of Education and the Oklahoma Head Start Programs	State Superintendent of Public Instruction Director, Division of Economic Opportunity Director, Head Start T/TA
	AR	No signed agreement, but Head Start applies to SEA for funds generated through participation in Child Count, and receives funds directly	

[1] ACYF connotes a signature by the ACYF Regional Program Director or Acting Director

Table 3.21 - Cont'd

		Title of Agreement	Signing Parties
Region VII	KS	Head Start-Kansas State Department of Education Cooperative Agreement	Commissioner, State Department of Education ACYF
	NB	Head Start-Nebraska Department of Education Cooperative Agreement	Nebraska Education Agency ACYF
Region VIII	ND	Collaborative Agreement between the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction/Special Education and Region VIII, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
	SD	Cooperative Agreement between the Section for Special Education (SEA) and Region VIII Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Director of Special Education ACYF
	UT	Utah State Office of Education/Regional Head Start Cooperative Agreement	State Superintendent ACYF
Region IX	AZ	Arizona Head Start grantees have contracted with the Arizona Department of Education for Part B-EHA LEA Entitlement Funds.	
	CA	Interagency Agreement between the State Department of Education/ Office of Special Education and the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Region IX, Head Start, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	State Department of Education ACYF
	HA	Agreement between the Department of Education, State of Hawaii and Head Start Programs in Hawaii	Superintendent, Department of Education Directors, Hawaii Head Start Grantees
	Palau	Interagency Agreement between the Government of Palau Health Services, Education/Special Education Department and the Head Start for the Provision of Health Services and Education Services	Health Services Education Department Palau Community Action Agency
	Federated States of Micronesia Ponape	Interagency Agreement	Ponape Special Education Coordinator Vocational Education Supervisor Vocational Rehabilitation Coordinator Ponape Head Start Coordinator
	Federated States of Yap	Handicapped Children, Youth and Adult Inter-Agency Agreement	Director, Department of Education Special Education Coordinator Acting Director, Health Services Public Health Officer Yap Head Start Director
	Guam	Memorandum of Agreement	Division of Special Education Head Start
	Truk	Memorandum of Agreement Among Agencies, Department of Health, Department of Education and Head Start of Truk	Department of Education Department of Health Services Head Start of Truk
	Marshall Islands	Interagency Agreement between Vocational Rehabilitation, Vocational Education, Head Start Program, Special Education, Public Health	Special Education Vocational Rehabilitation Vocational Education Head Start Health Services
Region X	ID	Interagency Agreement between the Idaho Department of Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region X, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	State Superintendent of Public Instruction ACYF
	WA	Interagency Agreement between the State of Washington, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region X, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	State Superintendent of Public Instruction ACYF
	OR	Interagency Agreement between the Oregon Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services Region X, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Department of Education ACYF Portland State University RAP
	AK	Memorandum of Agreement between State of Alaska, Department of Education, Administration for Children, Youth and Families/Region X, and Indian Migrant Program Division	Commissioner, State Department of Education Acting Commissioner, ACYF Administrator, Office of Special Services Regional Administrator, Office of Human Development Services

Table 3.22

Abbreviated Contents of SEA/Head Start Collaborative Agreements

	STATES																																									U.S. TERRITORIES								
Signers of Agreements[1]	AZ	AR[4]	CA	CT	DE	DC	FL	GA	HI	ID	IL	KS	KY	LA	MD[4]	MA	MI	MN	MS	NE	NJ	NY	NC	ND	OH	OR	OK	SD	UT	WA	WI	GU	MIs	PAL	PON	PR	TRU	VI	YAP	AK
ACYF	NA	NA	x	x	x			x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	NA	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x										x
HS						x	x		x		x						x															x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Other Agencies																																	x		x						
HS Contractor															x										x	x	x														
Facilitators[2]																																									
RAP	x		x	x	x	x		x	x		x		x			x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	
Other		*					x			x*	x*		x*		x		x*				x				x*		x*				x*	x								x
Key Points of Agreements[3]																																									
Identification			x		x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x				x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x					x		x			
Child Count/Child Find	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x		x	x						x		x					x			x		x			
Screening			x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x			x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x			x					x
Assessment			x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x			x	x		x				x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Diagnosis			x					x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x				x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Referral			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x				x					x	x	x	x		x									x
Placement			x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x						x	x		x	x						x	x				x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Dual Enrollment			x		x	x	x	x			x							x				x				x	x			x	x	x								
Direct Services			x	x					x		x	x						x			x																			
IEPs			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x			x		x	x				x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x
Transition Planning			x		x	x	x	x		x	x			x		x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x
Information/Data Sharing					x	x	x	x		x	x	x					x	x		x	x	x			x	x		x	x	x							x		
Shared T/TA			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x											x							
Training on Collaboration				x						x	x						x																							
Transportation										x	x						x		x			x																		
Equipment/Material Sharing						x				x		x					x																							
Encourage LEA/HS Agree'mnts				x		x	x			x		x	x			x	x	x				x		x	x		x		x	x	x					x	x	x		
HS gets $ thru SEA	x	x				x			x							x						x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x		x						x
Identifies RAP							x	x	x		x											x	x	x					x	x										
Renegotiate/Review Annually			x	x			x				x		x					x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x										x
																																									x

1. SEA is a signer of all agreements, = Director of Special Ed., etc.; ACYF=Reg'l office program director or acting director; HS=HS grantees; Other depts.= Health, Voc. Ed., Social Services, etc.; HS Contractor=RAP, STO, T/TA provider, state HC advocate, etc.; NA=not formal signed agreements, e.g., HS included in a memo, state plan or legislation; 2. Other=HS Advocate, STO, etc.; *=RAP assisted; 3. CoIntents not invlusive; 4. Contents of agreements not available.

abbreviated form.) Respondents reported that agreements had been drafted and await official sanction in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Illinois, and American Samoa. Others had been revised or were in the process of revision in Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Hawaii. Alabama and North Dakota representatives contemplated the development of agreements, and respondents in New York, Florida, Michigan, and the Mariana Islands mentioned RAPs' assistance with some particular aspect of their agreements.

According to 21 percent of the SEA respondents, RAP is a provider of various resources, including Head Start enrollment figures on a county basis, recommendations for changes in services to young children with handicaps, information on EPSDT, appropriate child abuse prevention tools, assistance in developing guidelines for identifying young children with learning problems, and assistance in writing a Preschool Incentive Grant proposal. In turn, RAP uses SEA as a provider, according to 18 percent of the survey respondents, to obtain regulations for service to children with handicaps in private schools, interpretation of other laws and regulations, referrals, speakers for conferences, workshops developed by SEA staff, and recommendations for the RAP needs assessment process.

There are sundry "other" types of exchanges between SEAs and RAPs; 46 percent of the respondents cited some miscellaneous contact relegated to this category. Often this "other" work is time consuming but innovative. For example, Connecticut actively participates in a deferred diagnosis project. The SEA and RAP planned a reception at a Head Start program to publicize the signing of the revised agreement in Massachusetts. As a result of exposure to Head Start programs through RAP-sponsored training, the Massachusetts SEA has been invited to train throughout New England. The state of Alaska has funded RAP to replicate RAP services to Head Start programs in public schools across the state. In Indiana, RAP agreed to review a booklet on transitioning produced by the SEA and the State Advocate. Likewise in Washington, RAP revised an evaluation checklist for serving handicapped children. When referred by RAP, the Illinois SEA helped resolve particular cases of LEA non-compliance with monitoring requirements. In New York the SEA arranged a meeting to link RAP with HCEEP programs in the state. American Samoa received technical assistance from RAP with a grant to mainstream mildly handicapped children. In the states of Missouri and Florida, both RAP and the SEA hold positions on Head Start contractors' advisory boards.

Texas Tech, Los Angeles, and Alaska have been helpful in the development or implementation of SIG projects. In Louisiana, RAP identified six Head Start sites for the SIG project, set up a meeting with the ACYF Regional Office, drafted written products, and assisted with the interpretation of Head Start policy for serving handicapped children. The Alaska RAP helped with the preparation of the proposal for the grant. The California SEA representative did not specify the type of assistance received by RAP, but acknowledged its usefulness.

Frequency of Contact. On the average, RAPs are in contact with SEAs slightly less often than monthly, by mail, phone, and personal contacts. The regularity of communication is about the same as in 1982-83. Overall, 54 percent of the states are in communication with RAPs monthly or more often; 26 percent are in touch occasionally, and 16 percent have relatively infrequent contacts. Note that 17 SEA representatives (30%) were new to their positions within the last twelve months, so contact was reduced as past liaisons departed and new staff oriented themselves to all facets of their positions.

Initiation of Contact. Another pattern of communication established over previous years continues: most contact (63%) was mutually initiated by RAP and the SEA; 26 percent of the cases reported RAP as the initiator of contact (usually where exchanges

are less frequent), and 7 percent indicated that the SEA usually initiated the contact with RAP.

Most Valuable Service. SEAs viewed the most valuable services offered by RAPs as training (26%), serving as a resource to SEAs (26%), and serving as a resource to Head Starts (23%).

Satisfaction with RAPs' services. When asked to rate their satisfaction with RAPs' work, the average score for the network measured 3.3 on a 4-point scale (4=excellent, 3=good, 2=fair, 1=poor), a minor drop from 3.5 last year, and identical to that of the preceding year. Ratings for particular RAPs ranged from a "4" at Chapel Hill, Nashville, University of Illinois, and Alaska to below "3" at NYU, Texas Tech, Region VII, Los Angeles, and PSU. In every instance of low scores, one or more respondents had had little or no contact with RAP. Where informants could not provide a rating on satisfaction due to little or no communication, the evaluators assigned a "1" score, substantially penalizing the RAPs. (Eliminating this penalty would raise all the low scores to "3" or above, except Los Angeles, which would remain the same at 2.9.)

High satisfaction scores tend to be dependent upon frequent contact and varied types of contact. Those RAPs with most frequent communication with SEAs (Chapel Hill, Illinois, Portage, and Alaska) tend to have relatively high satisfaction scores. The exception is the Pacific RAP. Likewise, RAPs with more types of contact (New England, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Illinois, Alaska, and Portage) also scored satisfaction ratings on the high end of the scale.

The comments of the majority of respondents support the overall high ratings.

> (About New England)... RAP is a place for people to turn to when they need help, like a doctor...
>
> (About NYU)... We have a close working relationship. It's a good agency and they do some good things...
>
> (About Region III)... Outstanding people. Don't know how they get done what they do with so few people. Well organized...
>
> (About Chapel Hill)... Very positive, very responsive, very professional approach to work. They seem to enjoy their work...
>
> (About Nashville)... They are a neutral entity to help with problems in Head Start in the state. They can lay out alternatives. Sometimes we're too close to the situation...
>
> (About Mississippi)... We provide communication back and forth so we know what each is doing...
>
> (About the University of Illinois)... They're a bundle of information, nice, prompt, available, open. Enjoy working with them...
>
> (About Portage)... Vitally needed service. RAP provides collaboration among the states. The status of Head Start has really improved and RAP training has a lot to do with it...
>
> (About Texas Tech)... RAP is a great bunch. So helpful and supportive. Really instrumental in assisting SEA with the interpretation of Head Start regulations...

(About Region VII)... Very professional and helpful. I love the opportunity to meet with counterparts in other states at RAP advisory committee to discuss issues that impact on the four state area...

(About University of Denver)... Always find RAP very accommodating...

(About Los Angeles)... Very good staff. I can always call RAP with suggestions. They're very flexible. They're so involved and eager...

(About Pacific)... I'm glad they're there and hope they continue...

(About PSU)... Appreciate having RAP around and expect our mutual support will help handicapped children...

(About Alaska)... It is important for RAP to continue. Their resources expand the limited ones of the villages...

Not all comments were favorable and where they veered from the positive, the need was almost always for more service (except in the event of expressed problems, discussed later).

...RAP services are excellent, we just want more. We've had less communication with RAP than in the past and want to be tied in closer...(Oklahoma)

...RAP is always cooperative, but there has been little contact this year...(Texas)

...I have no complaints about RAP, just haven't had enough contact...(Missouri)

...Minimal contact with not a lot of follow-up in between... (Arizona)

...We haven't had as much contact as usual...(Nevada)

...Very positive personal contact with tremendous potential but I just don't have enough information about what they do... (Mariana Islands)

...I've had little contact and am not familiar enough with RAP. I don't know their goals...(Idaho)

Problems - Only three SEAs articulated a problem and each had a depressive effect upon the satisfaction score. A problem surfaced in Iowa where, if the SEA had been consulted before RAP was awarded the deferred diagnosis study, several obstacles would have been avoided. In the Mariana Islands, the SEA recognized the enormous assistance working with RAP would lend to their relationship with the Head Start grantee, but the SEA wanted input into the process of assessing needs and planning training for Head Start, and wanted a community college to furnish some of the training. The Saipan SEA complained that he had spent time helping RAP plan training for Head Start and LEA teaching staff with a community college, and does not understand why the training never materialized.

All three respondents would have been mollified by more communication. Discussions prior to the grant in the Iowa situation would probably have avoided the problem altogether. In the other two cases, an explanation for decisions surrounding training would probably resolve the questions that continue in Saipan and the Mariana Islands.

Suggestions - Although most SEAs were generally satisfied with RAPs' performance, judging by the ratings and favorable comments, nonetheless half offered suggestions for improvements. Most of these were specific to a local issue or a specific need of an SEA respondent: help with the classification of language problems, desire for regional office attendance at RAP advisory meetings, assistance with monitoring regulations, more service for high risk children. Where there was consensus about improvement, the message was for more familiarity with RAP operations and more contact: e.g., a brochure on what RAP does, what its everyday operations are, more contact, better communication, "want to know their goals."

Case Studies of Interactions Between SEA and Head Start - To examine the relationships between state education agencies and Head Start, the evaluators interviewed five SEA representatives about particular projects in which Head Start and the SEA collaborated to improve services for handicapped children. Three have been selected to illustrate these productive efforts, and are presented below.

Case Study #1
Collaboration Between Head Start and The State Education Agency in Colorado

The Objective: Although a collaborative agreement does not currently exist between Head Start and the SEA in Colorado, RAP and the SEA have conducted training on local collaboration for Head Starts and LEAs for the past three years. Head Start has been a partner in this effort because it is one of the primary preschool providers in the state. As a result of the training, community teams have been formed to develop agreements among local agencies which serve preschool children with handicapping conditions. The objectives of the community teams are to improve local services to handicapped preschoolers, to eliminate the duplication of services, to facilitate consumer access to services, and to eliminate gaps in service. Programs other than LEAs and Head Start which have been encouraged to participate are Developmental Disabilities, and departments of health, mental health, and social services.

Description of the Project: Efforts in the first year of this project focused only on sharing information with LEAs and Head Starts about how to coordinate their efforts to serve handicapped preschoolers. The SEA and RAP jointly sponsored five training sessions for LEA and Head Start personnel who were interested in establishing collaborative agreements.

In the second and third years the focus expanded to include multiple agencies in the community team process in addition to Head Start and LEAs. Eight sites in the second year and another eight in the third were selected, and teams of up to 25 persons were formed. Each community team has approached their partnership task differently. For example, one raised public awareness regarding services available to the handicapped to enhance local Child Find efforts; another team developed a process for joint screenings and assessments. RAP facilitated three of the local agreements in the state, each of which clarifies whom shall be responsible for which services, or, in one case, makes the LEA responsible for those professional services to which Head Start does not have access.

The SEA has used $10,000 from the State Implementation Grant (SIG) to find representatives from each team to attend SEA-sponsored statewide conferences on collaboration. Workshop trainers have been staff from the SEA and RAP, as well as consultants. The SEA has also made technical assistance available to community teams as needed. In August, 1984, the SEA planned a one day training conference for parents to increase their participation in the community team process.

Changes Resulting from the Effort: Informal feedback has indicated that, as a result of the joint training and the community team partnerships, levels of communication and understanding have both increased. Cooperation appears to have generalized to other areas at the local level. A third party evaluation is being conducted on the first eight sites, so more formal findings will become available.

Problems: Among teams, the SEA, and the RAP alike, the greatest frustration has been coordinating time and schedules. Teams have experienced frustration in not having the funds to do as much as they would like to do. They also experienced some initial nebulousness before determining their goals and building momentum.

Suggestions for ACYF: The SEA expects to be in a better position to offer concrete suggestions to ACYF next year. A state level collaborative agreement with Head Start is now in the planning stages. The SEA and RAP intend to disseminate the final document through one day regional conferences. The agreement will be written as a prototype to be used at the local level.

Case Study #2
Collaboration Between Head Start and The State Education Agency in Connecticut

The Objective: When the state of Connecticut applied for and received a Preschool Incentive Grant (PIG) from the Department of Education, it used the funds to provide training and technical assistance to programs serving young handicapped children rather than simply giving the money to LEAs to buy more teachers, as some states do. The $38,000 PIG is thus being used to meet the following objectives: to support special education children in Head Start; to bring service agencies closer together; to stop duplication of services; and to facilitate mainstreaming.

The Context: The Connecticut SEA chose to work with Head Start because the two agencies share intersecting mandates to serve handicapped preschoolers. Furthermore, interagency collaboration is an important component of Connecticut's state implementation grant (SIG). Because the SIG is a planning grant and plays a coordinating function in establishing systems, no direct services are provided. The PIG, on the other hand, does have a direct service function and may be used to provide personnel with the tools needed to serve handicapped children in the classroom.

Collaboration between the SEA and Head Start is not new to Connecticut. In 1982-83, an interagency agreement facilitated by RAP fostered collaboration between LEAs and Head Start by encouraging the use of Head Start programs as integrated placements, and suggesting other areas for collaboration. These included setting aside a portion of Head Start's over-income slots for referrals from an LEA; schools' contracting with Head Start and paying full tuition; involving Head Start staff in all PPTs when Head Start is being considered as a placement; and determinations by the PPT on all necessary related services. Three pilot projects were selected to test, refine and demonstrate collaborative strategies which could be replicated statewide. Interagency teams composed of SEA, RAP, Head Start, and Regional Office personnel provided T/TA to each site, and a joint Head Start/SEA conference was held to train Head Starts and LEAs to implement the agreement. Throughout, an interagency steering committee of

people affected by the agreement played a coordinating and problem-solving role. In the past year site personnel and interagency teams met to share and compare their experiences.

Description: There are two aspects to the most recent initiative. First, the PIG funds have been specifically set aside to encourage Head Starts and LEAs to work more closely as a concurrent system and to serve handicapped children in Head Start which are identified by public schools. Public schools do serve three to five year olds, but have set up special classrooms for the moderately impaired. SIG and PIG personnel are encouraging school systems, especially the smaller ones, to use Head Start as a viable placement rather than hiring additional personnel. Secondly, the PIG is funding an early childhood network to offer training and technical assistance around special education issues to whomever is providing care for handicapped preschoolers. RAP and the SEA have been working to interest ACYF/Region I in funding a position on this early childhood network team. The team is intended to be an interagency team with a variety of professionals who can be responsive to the T/TA needs of LEAs, Head Starts, and day care personnel and, in the process, bring people closer together. At the same time, Head Starts are being encouraged to serve more severely handicapped children, which they have appeared willing to do.

Changes Due to Effort: Though still in its early stages, the most salient change resulting from this interagency effort appears to be a growing sense that no one agency need feel solely responsible for meeting the needs of young children with handicapping conditions. It is hoped that in the course of sharing this responsibility some of the chronic turf issues which have retarded local collaboration will also disappear. Connecticut also intends to use this model for services to 0 to three year olds as it encourages the school system to think of other providers to share the service burden. A potential outcome of the current initiative may be the numbers of children who are re-labeled, although these statistics have yet to be collected.

Out of the efforts of the interagency teams established under the 1982-83 SEA/Head Start agreement have come 10 local collaborative agreements.

Problems Encountered in the Collaborative Process: Respondents mentioned the amount of time required to coordinate efforts among several agencies, and ambiguity about where the primary responsibility lies for meeting the needs of handicapped youngsters.

Suggestions to Facilitate the Collaborative Process. From the Connecticut SEA's experience, it was recommended that ACYF determine what arrangements or understanding SEAs and Head Starts have worked out in each state. The SEA has also found it helpful to identify people in other agencies who are interested in collaboration, and to persist in developing a working relationship with them.

Case Study #3
Collaboration Between Head Start and The State Education Agency in Louisiana

The Objective: Using a model for service delivery developed under PL 94-142 discretionary funding, the State of Louisiana applied for and received a State Incentive Grant. The objective of the SIG grant replicates the established model for assembling a process to identify, evaluate, and serve handicapped children from birth to five years in each of six sites. Each site has a participating LEA and Head Start program. The Association for Retarded Citizens, Public Health, Maternal and Child Health, and Regional Handicapped Children's Clinics also participate.

The Problem: In Louisiana where Head Start programs serve four-year old children, the state mandates service from three years for children with handicaps. Most of the children with handicaps have already been enrolled in public schools by the time they are eligible for the Head Start mainstreaming experience. Moreover, public schools offer full-day services in contrast to the part-day sessions available through Head Start. Dual enrollment was interpreted to be a nearly prohibited option under PL 94-142 restrictions. Another major problem was the absence of certified teaching staff within Head Start programs.

The Solution: The SEA representative described Head Start as the initiator in the collaborative process. Seeking shared placement programs that were acceptable under the framework of PL 94-142, a choice of service options was developed. One service option developed for shared placement permits LEA special education intervention by using certified itinerant personnel to travel to the child or parent (or Head Start teacher in place of the parent) for one day per week for one and one half hours per day.

Under a second option, children qualify for special services provided through the speech therapist assigned to public schools, and Head Start transports the children.

Description of the Project: The LEA has the responsibilities of evaluating the child, developing an IEP, and providing service. The Public Health Service identifies children, and the Maternal and Child Health Agency screens and refers children. Head Start is a placement for children. Under this agreement, children are jointly enrolled in the public school system and Head Start; the parent then elects to enroll the child in Head Start and the LEA chooses itinerant service.

The first year is a planning period: identifying the sites and components and working through some anticipated problems. Next year staff will field test the model. The State Implementation Grant provides $91,000 for each of two years.

Changes Resulting from the Effort: Although still in the planning stage of the project, SEA staff were able to identify some changes that had occurred as a result of the effort. The Texas Tech RAP was instrumental in clarifying policy with regard to serving children with handicaps in Head Start. RAP set a meeting with the ACYF Regional Office and State Education Agency staffs to discuss the issues of certification of teachers, joint enrollment policy, and diagnostic criteria. (Louisiana uses non-categorical diagnosis for children under 16; Head Start requires categorical diagnosis.) The agencies reached consensus. The state of Louisiana now has a new interpretation of Head Start as a placement. LEAs and Head Start programs are talking together to lay plans for the second year of the project.

Suggestions for ACYF: The SEA representative acknowledged the strong commitment of Head Start to serve handicapped children, and suggested a further need for ACYF and the Department of Education to collaborate on the national level, encourage more state level involvement between SEA's and Head Start, explore alternative service models, and employ the practice of itinerant teachers particularly suited for mild delays. The SEA representative envisioned an increasing demand for mainstreamed settings due to the growing numbers of premature infants saved through neonatal clinics. In preschool years, such children delay developmentally, especially in language development. While special classes are inappropriate, the child can be managed in the mainstreaming environment that Head Start offers, but more cooperation is necessary at the local level between LEA and Head Start.

These three case studies illustrate the complexity and difficulties of Head Start-SEA collaboration, and suggest that SEAs, Head Start, and RAPs have persisted in order to discover mutually beneficial ways to work with one another.

Collaboration with Local Education Agencies

The most visible strategy used by RAPs to facilitate agreements at the local level is to directly involve themselves in the development and negotiation of the agreements. However, RAPs only rarely do this, because: 1) there are no formal lines of authority beween RAPs and LEAs; 2) there may be hundreds of LEAs within a RAP's catchment area and 3) RAPs recognize that the benefits are greater to all parties when Head Start and public school staffs are responsible for the development of agreements themselves, using the counsel of RAP only if necessary.

Only four RAPs have become directly involved in the development of local agreements this year; they have had to be selective about the cases chosen for development. New England, Mississippi, PSU, and Alaska were responsible for 10 agreements. Los Angeles continued to work closely with the Los Angeles public school system on a set of agreements reported last year.

Most RAPs have elected to promote collaboration through:

- training of Head Start on the collaborative process;
- inviting Head Start and public school staffs to joint meetings or conferences;
- providing technical assistance to cooperating parties needing advice or information; and
- distributing materials helpful to the collaborative process.

Collaboration with Other Agencies Serving Children with Handicaps

Securing better services for preschool children with handicaps has introduced RAP staffs to a broader community than Head Start and the public school systems. Many of these relationships predated RAP, but many others have grown out of a more recent increase in awareness of the genuine need to coordinate services for very young handicapped children. The need for both special education and an early childhood approach to education also led RAP personnel to positions of advocacy as appointees on commissions. The absence of a Head Start presence at some state levels has moved RAP into contacts with state agencies other than those established for education.

The exposure of the RAP projects to other groups, and vice versa, has created a reciprocal sharing of services which takes form on several levels:

- Use of providers from other agencies as presenters at RAP training;
- Participation on committees to improve or coordinate services for young children with handicaps;
- Training of groups other than Head Start staff;
- Referrals for children; and

- Development of formal agreements with agencies other than education systems.

Table 3.23, Other Agencies Collaborating with RAP, shows the providers with which RAPs have had continuing activity this year. The miscellaneous category in the table includes the dissemination of materials, some unspecified coodinating functions, or review of materials.

RAPs' involvement with agencies serving young handicapped children brings to Head Start an exposure that has rarely been experienced before. On the local level it provides an ongoing link between providers and Head Start programs. In a larger context, it raises the importance of issues related to early intervention for children with special needs, such as serving handicapped children in rural settings or avoiding duplication of services.

Table 3.23

Other Agencies Collaborating with RAP

RAP	Participation on Committees	Referrals	Presentation at RAP Training	Receives Training From RAP	Collaborative Agreements	Miscellaneous*
New England	Rural Network		Children's Hospital Department of Health			
NYU			National Association for the Blind Epilepsy Foundation			State Training Office
Region III	Early Intervention Network	Howard University Temple University Children's Hospital		Human Resources		State Training Office
Chapel Hill	Georgia Interagency Forum		Human Resources	Human Resources Day Care		Social Services
Nashville	Alabama Handicap Advisory Committee Tennessee Early Intervention Network for Children with Handicaps					
Mississippi	HCEEP Mesh Consortium		Colleges Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect EPSDT Retarded Center			Exchange Club
University of Illinois	AEYC HCEEP				EPSDT	EPSDT Resource Center
Portage			Bimidji State University Governors Committee on People with Developmental Disabilities		SSI	Advocate
Texas Tech					Developmental Disabilities	EPSDT
University of Kansas						Crippled Children's Society Ear Institute
University of Denver	Regional Office Child Care Task Force			Day Care Developmental Disabilities		
Los Angeles	State Interagency Task Force				Developmental Disabilities Department of Economic Security	
Pacific		Handicapped Children's Resource Center Shriners Hospital	Easter Seal United Cerebral Palsy Hospital			Department of Health Infant Enrichment Program
PSU		Developmental Disabilities		CEC AEYC		
Alaska	AEYC Speech & Hearing Association	Protection and Advocacy for Developmental Disabilities		Catholic Social Services	Alaska Resources for the Moderately and Severely Impaired	Department of Regional and Community Affairs

Actively Participate in RAP Task Forces

The RAP scope of work requires contractors to participate in task forces appointed by ACYF; members are assigned or may volunteer. Over the years government project officers have used the task forces to advise on timely issues (e.g., study of the incidence of speech impaired children in Head Start), to develop products (e.g., "What Does PL 94-142 Mean to Head Start"), and to respond to gaps in RAPs' service delivery systems (e.g., computerized management information system). Overall, RAPs rated this task of moderate importance in 1983-84.

For the first five years of the network, membership on these task forces required participation at meetings held during the semi-annual national RAP meetings with only occasional research or communication among RAP members between meetings. Task force efforts were generally in the service of the RAP scope of work and directly augmented RAPs' delivery of training, technical assistance, collaboration, and dissemination. In the past three years, however, and particularly in 1983-1984, RAPs have been enlisted to shape policy and develop strategies and products which, although focused on Head Start children with special needs, will have an impact on far broader populations.

For the first time, task force participation seemed to burden the network. Technically, nine task forces functioned at one time or another over the course of the year. Several individual RAP staff members finishing up an assignment on one were immediately assigned to another. A single RAP might have served on as many as four or five task forces during the year, and each assignment meant the production of more materials. Several of these work groups had to meet two to three times in addition to meeting at the two national RAP meetings, and do much more of their work at RAPs' home offices.

RAPs were challenged by the expectations held for them as task forces participants this year and they rose to the occasion. It is RLA's observation, however, that the strain on the network was exacerbated by unusual conditions that can be remediated. The problems which RAPs reported are discussed in detail later in this section, as are some related observations on the implications of the problems for future task force assignments.

RAPs began the 1983-84 program year as members of four task forces: PA26; Innovative Approaches to Increasing the Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start; Language Development; and Child Abuse Track I. Almost immediately the first two were combined into a task force on TN 73.4* with an expanded mission to revise the Head Start policy on serving handicapped children. Four new task forces were subsequently formed during the course of the year: Child Abuse Track II; Diagnostic Criteria; Film on Spina Bifida; and RAP/Regional Office Coordination. The latter task forces will be discussed here since the task forces on PA26 and Innovative Approaches had completed most of this work by this program year and are fully reported in last year's Impact Evaluation.

*A transmittal notice to Head Starts to mainstream handicapped children.

Task Force on Language Development

Members: University of Denver (co-chair), Chapel Hill (co-chair), NYU, Nashville, Mississippi, University of Illinois, Texas Tech, PSU, and Alaska

The language development task force carried over from the previous year. Having reviewed language stimulation curricula used in the mainstreamed setting and clarified its own goals and objectives, the task force found it was important to differentiate between language and speech. It subsequently outlined and drafted a manual to be used by handicap/education coordinators to train teachers to be effective language stimulators. The manual is written as two sections. Part one includes criteria for selection and development of language curriculum materials, as well as criteria for assessing staff strengths and needs in facilitating language development in the classroom. It includes a teacher self-assessment tool for selective language stimulation curricula, an annotated bibliography of language stimulation materials, and a checklist for evaluating commercial language programs.

Part two comprises training modules on the development of language, the influence of culture and dialect on language development and usage, the role of adults in stimulating language, and on planning and implementing language activities. The task force has also outlined an appendix on culture and compiled information on working relationshps among teachers and speech and language therapists. Materials are being developed, but have not yet been completed.

Task Force on Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, Track I

Members: Region III (chair), Chapel Hill, Portage, Los Angeles, and Portland State University

The child abuse and neglect task force functioned as two tracks this year. Track I had been funded jointly in FY'83 by the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) and Head Start. Through Chapel Hill, Portage, and PSU five RAPs received funding, and for the first time RAPs were placed in the position of having to monitor each other's work. Funds came late and were accompanied by little technical direction from ACYF regarding products. Furthermore, there was initial confusion about the distinction between two RAPs' assignments and about the relationship among others. The common denominator appeared to be that each of the five RAPs was interested in the issue of child abuse and neglect and had been assigned to the same task force. Perhaps the task force model was not appropriate for this effort.

Track I has produced a comprehensive training package and manual on primary intervention, Preventing Maltreatment of Children with Handicaps. Sections include identifying children at risk (Northwest Resource Associates), developing child abuse policies (PSU RAP), developing interagency agreements with child protective services (LA RAP), interpersonal helping skills (Region III RAP), and building healthy families (Portage RAP). Portage also produced a slide tape show to be used with their section to motivate parent policy councils or others "...to improve on the excellent job Head Start is already doing [to prevent child abuse and neglect.]" In addition, Chapel Hill RAP developed the Kinship in Nurturing (KIN) model, primarily using paid Head Start staff to support parents in rural settings. The materials may be used with two slide tape shows: "Implications of Child Abuse and Neglect for Children with Special Needs" and "Kinship in Nurturing." Each piece was developed separately by individual RAPs, and each can be used alone or in conjunction with others. This training will be conducted by RAPs in 1984-85.

Task Force on Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, Track II

Members: Chapel Hill (chair), New England, Region III, Region VII, and Portland State University

An interagency agreement between DHHS/ACYF and the Department of Education, in cooperation with Developmental Disabilities, spawned Track II of the child abuse and neglect task force this year. The Department of Education augmented funding for Track II and funded the film on spina bifida described later. This collaboration supported five RAPs selected by ACYF, working with the UAFs in each of the cities where they were located to develop approaches to reducing stress among families with children with special needs. Each of these sites was to implement demonstration projects on child abuse prevention strategies for families with three Head Starts and three public schools. The task force was to review materials developed by the Track I team to determine whether these could be adapted to public schools. Part of the funding was committed to an evaluation of Track II.

As in the case of Track I, each had a different assignment. This time not all RAPs were funded, and those who were received different amounts in January 1984. Some RAPs had to identify and hire personnel to coordinate their new grants. These coordinators, as well as the UAF representatives, joined the RAPs as working partners, necessitating increased efforts on everyone's part to understand sometimes differing perspectives on the prevention of child abuse. A decision to use one model developed by Track I instead of exploring alternatives came as a surprise to some members.

The task force's core approach relates to prevention of child abuse through support. It worked as two subcommittees, one focusing on the transition process, and the other on strategies for family support. The transition subcommittee (New England, Region III and PSU) explored processes by which a child at risk moves from Head Start to public school and how one accesses, secures, and maintains an administrative support system throughout this process. Members developed and piloted materials intended to minimize conflict and the duplication of services by clarifying the roles of administrators in both Head Start and public school settings.

The family support subcommittee (New England, Region III, Chapel Hill, Region VII, and PSU) drew on three models for providing assistance to families at risk:

1) Parent support aides
2) Parent education
3) Parent support groups

Each RAP using the parent support aide model approached it differently. Chapel Hill used volunteers as the aides; Region VII enlisted Head Start component staff as well as LEA preschool intervention teams (i.e., psychologists, social workers, speech pathologists); and New England used Head Start support staff. Parent support aides establish rapport with families and involve them in a variety of skill building and social activities in an effort to offset some of the stress and isolation they experience.

Three RAPs (Region III, Region VII, and PSU) applied three distinct parent education models in their work with families, theorizing that an increase in knowledge about parenting and survival skills increases coping skills. These three models range from

basic education (e.g., nutrition, behavior management, self needs) to a self growth model (e.g., values clarification) to an advocacy model (i.e., helping parents understand special education, what they can expect, roles and responsibilities, and the transition process).

The third model, parent support groups, was utilized by Chapel Hill RAP. Parents in families at risk meet as peers to discuss issues and to solve problems; the support system is intended to alleviate stress on these parents.

All models and products were field tested by task force members in their Head Start and public school pilot sites. The transition materials are viewed as an adjunct to the family support materials. All are designed to be used in Head Start and in public school settings.

The ultimate goal of this task force is a comprehensive collection of materials on support systems available to families with children with handicapping conditions. Materials will be contained in a notebook format with accompanying media. Track II (draft) materials are perceived by both task force members as being complementary to materials produced by Track I.

Task Force on the Revision of TN 73.4

Members: Region VII (chair), New England, NYU, Chapel Hill,Nashville, University of Illinois, University of Denver, Los Angeles, Alaska, and Pacific

The recommendations of the revision of TN 73.4 were undertaken by members from two 1982-83 task forces (PA26 and Increasing the Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start). The task force drafted a revision of TN 73.4 as well as the guidance materials, not only for TN 73.4 but also for PA26 expenditures.

In their summary of the proposed revisions of TN 73.4, the RAP task force explains that "the original version of 73.4 was designed to provide guidance to Head Start programs in creating the handicap effort then new to Head Start. Much of the content was related to start up procedures. Proposed revisions of 73.4 built upon the base established by the original practices now in common use in Head Start, as well as provisions of PL 94-142, and is intended to give guidance to the ongoing handicap effort in place in Head Start...."

Among other things, the proposed revisions apply the 10 percent enrollment mandate on a grantee basis rather than on a statewide basis, and specify that handicap coordinators be hired by grantees and have direct involvement in preparing a Handicap Services Plan and the PA26 budget. The guidance drafted for TN 73.4 is presented not as policy but as "suggestions and recommendations which may be helpful in the implementation of the requirements stated in the policies." The funding guidance developed for PA26 elaborates on core capability, evaluation of children, services, transportation, special equipment and materials, modification of physical facilities, training and technical assistance, and preventive services.

The task force worked hard to reach consensus on the proposed policy revisions and wording. Because RAPs so well understand the issues of special education and Head Start, no decision was made without exploring the implications. The intent was to word the guidance materials broadly enough so that creative programs could exercise their own discretion in implementing the guidance, yet specifically enough so that the intent of the guidance was clear to less experienced programs.

Task Force on the Examination of the Diagnostic Criteria

Members: NYU (chair), New England, Chapel Hill, Nashville, University of Denver, Los Angeles, and Pacific

The diagnostic criteria task force was formed upon completion of the policy revision task force's assignment described above. It was instructed to examine the need for revisions of the diagnostic criteria currently used by Head Start. The task force has been given clear objectives to:

- assure the compatibility of Head Start's diagnostic criteria with PL 94-142
- make the criteria as applicable and understandable as possible for Head Start staff and diagnosticians
- be responsive to grantees' recommendations

To date, the task force has canvassed all handicap coordinators to determine to what extent they have difficulty using the criteria and to solicit their recommendations for change. A common problem appears to be diagnosticians' reluctance to label young children. Other issues being confronted by the task force are whether Head Start criteria or state regulations take precedence, and whether to include conditions which are transitory. Members have also reviewed a list of "other" entries taken from the Program Information Report (PIR) to determine whether these conditions are being properly categorized. The task force has examined each category and reviewed the changes recommended by grantees. Currently, each task force member has assumed responsibility for refining the criteria for one handicapping condition, working with specialists in the field to do so.

Task Force on the Development of a Film on Spina Bifida

Members: Los Angeles (chair), NYU, Nashville, and Portage

The interagency agreement mentioned earlier between DHHS/ACYF and the Department of Education also awarded a grant to Child, Youth and Family Services, sponsoring agency of the Los Angeles RAP, to develop a film which demonstrates Head Start's ability to mainstream children with handicapping conditions. ACYF asked Nashville, NYU, and Portage RAPs to work with Los Angeles in October 1983. Task force members first reviewed existing films to determine whether they could be used for Head Start, and recommended that a film be produced focusing on a child with spina bifida. The film will be based on the "Mainstreaming Preschoolers" manual on orthopedic impairments. In the course of their work, members selected a Head Start site for filming, determined content, selected, and prioritized the types of scenes to be included.

In addition to the film on spina bifida, the task force will develop accompanying training materials. It will also make suggestions for changes in the ACYF mainstreaming manual on emotional disturbance. If funds become available, the task force will plan a film on serving the emotionally disturbed child in a mainstreamed setting.

Task Force on Regional Office/RAP Coordination

Members: Texas Tech and ACYF/Region VI (co-chairs), Nashville, University of Denver, and Los Angeles

The task force on coordination between RAPs and Regional Offices met once during the winter national RAP meeting. Members canvassed all RAPs and Regional Offices and wrote a position paper on areas of current and possible coordination.

Problems

A significant proportion of the problems cited by RAP task force members this spring related to the major burden that task force assignments have added above and beyond RAPs' already substantive scope of work. All RAPs have served on a minimum of two, and on as many as five, task forces during the '83-'84 program year. The goal of each task force has been a specific product or products. RAPs have developed at least 21 specific pieces between meetings. Some task force members completed products on one task force, only to be immediately assigned to another.

An even greater concern among RAPs this year had to do with failures in communication. Members of the Child Abuse and Neglect, Regional Office/RAP Coordination, PA26, TN 73.4, and Language Development task forces felt that their missions had not been made clear at the outset. Other examples of concern included inexplicit roles and responsibilities of members, unexpected or unexplained changes in task force directions, confusion about why some task forces had been created, and unclear expectations regarding products or the ultimate use of products.

Although RAPs have been critical before about task forces that were seemingly created on the spur of the moment, and without demonstrated need, or task forces on which they felt they had only token input, as well as about the rising costs of task force participation, this is the first year in which comments referred to friction within the network. It is difficult to develop materials independently which ultimately are to be compiled into an integrated package. It is also difficult to accommodate to a prime contractor/subcontractor relationship within a system of peers. Problems created by both of these circumstances may have been prevented had the task forces been more closely monitored. These difficulties were compounded by two changes in government project officers within the year. By the end of the program year draft materials had been developed by each task force and were being well received. Additionally, morale appeared to be growing where it had previously been low.

ACYF's "unrealistic expectations" categorized a third major area of concern. RAPs questioned some of the assumptions underlying the formation of these working groups. "Is it feasible to make changes in the diagnostic criteria?" "Is it possible to write a guidance which is strong but flexible, uniform but which also allows for differences?" "Is it realistic to blend all philosophies and strategies into one product which will be applicable to Head Start and public schools?" "Is it realistic to do what we are assigned to do within the time frames?" "Will this product be appropriate for all service areas?" Some task force members found it unrealistic to meet as frequently as the development of quality materials generally requires. Two RAPs felt that funds came too late to meet the original timelines.

Other problems were mentioned occasionally. Assignments to task forces seemed arbitrary to two RAPs, and unrelated to individuals' interests or expertise. Two RAPs felt that the Child Abuse and Neglect and the Language task forces were too large. Two were concerned that ACYF would not make a timely decision about revisions in TN 73.4 so that the TN 73.4 and PA26 guidance could be disseminated before grantees negotiated their FY'85 budgets.

Observations

The cost effectiveness of using task forces at the level of effort seen during 1983-84 bears examination. RLA staff determined that each RAP served on an average of 3.2 task forces during the 1983-84 program, each of which met an average of 1.5 times, in addition to the national RAP meetings; thus, RAP staff members attended an average of 72 meetings. Average per diem and travel costs were $788.00 per two and a half days. In total, RAP participation at task force meetings alone cost ACYF at least $56,736 this year.

If $56,736 were the actual and the only cost to ACYF, ACYF might well consider this money well spent and task forces to be a cost effective mechanism for getting important work done. Not included in the calculations, however, are the number of person days expended beyond task force meetings. Some RAP staff members estimated that they spent 15 to 25 percent of their time during the 1983-84 program year on task force related work at their home offices. Not only does this increase the cost to ACYF, but also one member of a 3.5 average FTE RAP staff who spends 15 to 25 percent of his or her time on task force work means less time available to spend on RAP's remaining tasks, and more of a burden on co-workers.

It is an unequivocal tribute to the RAP network that it accomplished so much this year without a significant drop in any of the satisfaction indexes calculated by evaluators. However, ACYF should assess whether maintaining this type of pressure on the network will eventually result in lower productivity unless either RAP tasks are reduced or budgets are increased. The magnitude of the task force workload has led some RAPs to suggest that this work be let to other contractors, feeling that the necessary level of effort detracts from the commitments they must make to grantees in their service areas. On the other hand, RAPs also view their work on task forces as a professionally challenging opportunity to solve real problems and to keep Head Start services relevant to handicapped preschoolers.

Maintain the RAPPLE Management Information System

A computerized management information system, known as RAPPLE, has been specifically developed for the RAP network. Each project is required to maintain the system by entering current information using identical computer hardware. Uniformity is imposed upon the network with the intention of facilitating data retrieval.

The RAPPLE software program contains three principal types of information:

1. Agency information consists of basic data (name, address, contact person, needs, capabilities) of Head Start grantees, resource providers, and others (referred to as non-Head Start grantees).

2. Resource information consists of annotated entries for all types of written and audio visual materials.

3. Event information contains the records of services RAP has delivered. Events consist of activities (requests for service and the RAP's response that require little time to transact) and task records (labor and time intensive transactions that pertain to specific RAP tasks).

The present RAPPLE system was developed for the RAP network by the New England RAP, under advisement of a task force consisting of staff from several RAP projects and the evaluation contractor.

The 1983-1984 program year is the first that the system has been extensively operational. Consequently, it was the first opportunity for RAPs to comment, affirmatively and negatively, upon various aspects of the MIS. This chapter will present the status of the implementation of the RAPPLE system, its benefits, and problems with the computerized system. This task was ranked as being of moderate importance.

Status of RAPPLE Implementation of Events. For the first year, every project had records on the computer for RLA to review. RAPs were required to send the data disks to RLA via the New England RAP. While the data eventually arrived, some were delayed because the entries were not kept current. Nonetheless, all RAPs recorded all activities and task records in the computer MIS for the period July 1983 through March 1984. Two RAPs, New England and Region VII, lost records due to faulty disks; neither had paper copies or backup diskettes.

Resources

Resources have been entered into the RAPPLE system by all but three RAPs (NYU, Region III, and the University of Illinois). Six RAPs (Portage, Region VII, Denver University, Pacific, and Alaska) have entries on a large scale. All others have documented between 16 and 70 entries.

Resource Providers

All but one RAP, Region VII, have entered resource providers into the RAPPLE system. At Nashville, University of Illinois, Portage, Texas Tech, Denver, Pacific and Alaska,

the number of provider entries exceeds 100. At other RAPs, the number ranges from six to 72.

Comparing the entries in the RAPPLE system to those in the paper files, shows that only one out of five resource providers have been entered into the computer. It is not known whether RAPs are inclined to enter most commonly used providers or those infrequently used. However, on the average, each RAP has logged about 100 providers into the system. The extended paper files of resources number an average of 480 providers per RAP, but only an average of 46 per RAP are used frequently. If the RAPPLE file of resource providers consists of those most frequently used, then the number of entries is sufficient. If the entries are providers less frequently used, then there is some cause for concern because the entries may have been limited by RAPs because the computer search is too slow to be useful (see comments below).

The evaluators suspect the latter situation to be the case because RAPs would be less likely to enter familiar providers since access to them by computer search is unnecessary. More beneficial would be access to less familiar sources for help -- those who don't come readily to mind; those who have more obscure specialties; those in distant or remote locations. However, when more than 90 percent of requests are satisfied by RAP staffs themselves, they may have determined that extensive entries of infrequently used providers are not worth the effort.

Benefits of the Computer

Most of the favorable comments pertained to the benefits of prepackaged software that accompanied the selection of the computer, namely, word processing capability, Visicalc, and the mail list manager. With regard to the RAPPLE system, comments were varied. The sundry remarks are as follows: RAPPLE is a good system for documentation, especially for activities; excellent RAPPLE manual; quick responses from the management contractor; MIS is a model for others in the region.

A few RAPs called for an evaluation of the RAPPLE system to improve certain aspects which will be discussed in the section that follows.

Problems

The specific problems of the RAPPLE system pertain to the system in general, the management of the system, task records, activities, hardware, and the program for resources.

System in general - The majority of RAPs (11) indicated that the system was too slow for entering and searching records. Eight RAPs found paper records easier, or better, or more useful with less duplication. (Many now fill out paper forms before entering information into the computer.) Four requested the development of a program for the RAP census. Three RAPs found the system wanting as a management information system, acknowledging its use only as a recordkeeping system. Two RAPs suggested a system for integrating data bases e.g., providers and events; and two wanted the word wrap capability on RAPPLE. Two indicated that they lost data due to inaccurate entry, and one RAP noted that the system did not allow for capturing information on new RAP or ACYF initiatives.

Management of the RAPPLE System - After one year of superior performance, the management contractor changed personnel. Some RAPs found the management contractor to be responsive and about as many did not. Three RAPs wanted a justification of the funds used by the management contractor. Two requested that the computer newsletter be reinstated. Other random comments noted the need for additional training on the

use of the modem and hard disk, and questioned the necessity of sending data disks to the management contractor.

Task Records - Of all RAPPLE programs, the task records presented the most problems. Task records were intended to document continuing, time intensive RAP efforts such as collaboration with State Education Agencies. In fact the record has little room for an expansive narrative, leading RAPs to complain that task records must be expanded, that efforts are difficult to track, and that content attributes are inapplicable.

Hardware - Three RAPs have experienced extensive or continual hardware breakdowns, perhaps the cause for suggestions to consider the selection of new hardware. Three RAPs proposed having more terminals for use by more staff; and one recommended linking RAPPLE with a mainframe to speed data retrieval efforts. A comprehensive range of software for the Apple III systems used by RAPs is not available; use of more widely accepted hardware, (such as CP/M or MS-DOS computers) would allow the use of hundreds of well-tested systems that would help to deal with the problems RAPPLE has encountered.

Activity Records - Most RAPs were satisfied with the program for recording activities, except for excessive time to enter and retrieve records. Other problems were that activities had to be printed individually, and three RAPs want the option of printing a range of activity forms within a selection parameter, such as a date.

Resources - The resource program is a low priority for one RAP because paper records provide faster access. Another RAP had to devise a new program using Applewriter for resources, because they lost part of their data after sending it to the management contractor.

Upon review of the favorable and unfavorable comments regarding the RAPPLE system, the evaluators endorse a formal assessment of the system by ACYF, the management contractor, and representation among the RAPs. Key points to incorporate in the review are:

- faster access to information in the RAPPLE system: the question to ask is why are the programs slow? Is it software (for example, can the programs be rewritten in assembly language) or hardware (the Apple's slow speed)?
- revision of task records
- consideration of new hardware or software
- reconsideration of RAPPLE to include supplementation with paper files, and the ability to tally statistical summaries quickly
- needs for additional assistance to RAPs to help them make full uses of the computers and their accessories (modems, hard disks)

4.

OTHER RAP TASKS

Plan of Work

A new task this year required RAPs to develop and implement a regional plan of work and submit a written copy as a contract deliverable. This replaced a task which required RAPs to assess the needs of their grantees for handicap-related training and technical assistance. The new task incorporated the intent of the former task, but also included two specific directives not previously linked to needs assessment, i.e., to facilitate transition to public schools and to offer to work cooperatively with other programs. RAPs ranked this task as being of major importance.

Every RAP submitted a document as required; however, these varied greatly in format and content. The variation among the plans can probably be attributed to an absence of guidance regarding formats, and no clear understanding of the task's purpose. In some cases, RAPs developed a new document, but others submitted an existing document (e.g., a copy of the scope of work from their funding proposal). Some described the RAPs' needs assessment process itself, while others emphasized how they planned to meet the needs already assessed. One plan consisted of the schedule of handicap T/TA events planned for each grantee in 1983-84; another contained a detailed state-by-state analysis of T/TA needs; one was a three-page letter which RAP had mailed to Head Start directors reviewing the RAP's roles and responsibilities and giving an overview of its primary activities.

Interviewers asked RAPs how they had determined priorities for providing services to Head Start grantees. Only one RAP had included a rationale for its service delivery system in its work plan; another simply stated that training was its priority because that was the region's priority. For the most part, RAPs answered the interview question by describing their needs assessment process. RAPs do determine their priorities in direct response to the expressed needs of grantees. Over the years, RAPs' needs assessment processes have become rather elaborate syntheses of information solicited from Head Start directors, handicap coordinators, teachers, aides, Regional Office personnel, other regional T/TA providers, and RAP Advisory Council members. Information is obtained through written forms (RAP-developed needs assessment forms, PIR data, program profiles, etc.), telephone conversations, meetings, and on-site visits. Most RAPs are in touch with grantees more than quarterly through one or more of the above types of contact.

Since this year's task also directed RAPs to facilitate transition, RLA staff also asked how RAPs had facilitated transition of children from Head Starts to public schools. Transitioning was addressed primarily through RAP training. Many made it a practice to invite public school teachers to RAP training. Several RAPs also felt they were facilitating transition by improving collaboration between Head Start and LEA staff. A number of RAPs developed materials on transition. More about RAPs' contact and cooperative efforts with major preschool programs and providers will be found in the earlier section on collaboration.

In sum, although a combination of many directives, this task did not seem to require more of the RAPs than had been expected before, except for the deliverable, and this is generally how RAPs have interpreted and responded to the task.

Maintain an Updated File of Resource Providers

RAP extend their own capability to meet Head Start needs through additional specialists and materials. Each RAP is required to develop a file of resource providers and to update it each year. This task was ranked as moderately important.

At the time of spring site visits, ten RAPs had completed updates of their provider files and five were still in progress. Some RAPs describe the process as ongoing, adding and deleting throughout the year.

Some RAPs update these lists by phoning providers or sending them a questionnaire to reconfirm their availability and contact information; others rely on Head Starts or Specially Funded Cluster coordinators to add the names and credentials of new local providers to RAP's resource bank. One RAP plans to contact local colleges and universities to uncover new resources, as well as national organizations. RAPs value the services these providers can offer grantees now, and also the potential for networking which can develop among Head Starts and local providers.

There are a total number of 7,258 service providers on file, an increase of 344 over last year's figures. Of these, RAPs reported using only 725 (10 percent) actively. On the average, each RAP used 48 additional resources regularly, ranging from 10 at Los Angeles to 118 at PSU.

Advisory Committees

Each RAP is required to establish its own advisory committee to consult with the RAP on general policies and procedures and to assist in planning, assessment, and evaluation. The committee is to be composed of at least one ACYF Regional Office representative, one Head Start director, and one parent of a handicapped child in Head Start. Suggested members include a representative of a local educational agency and one handicap coordinator. However, these and other possible committee members are included at each RAP's discretion.

The average RAP advisory committee was composed of 15 members, one more than last year, with sizes ranging from a low of 9 members at PSU to a high of 31 members at Region VII. All RAPs met the minimum requirements for membership; Alaska is excepted since their regional office is unable to send a representative due to limited travel funds. Three RAPs (Denver, University of Illinois, and Alaska) included both suggested representatives. Fourteen RAPs included handicap coordinators (there is no such position in the Pacific RAP's service area). All RAPs included SEA representation; a total of 50 SEAs sit on RAP advisory committees, representing 44 states and territories. Nine RAPs include all SEAs in their service area.

It is each RAP's decision to determine how often the advisory committee will meet. Twelve RAPs convened one meeting during the year, two held two meetings each, and Pacific held one meeting in each of its three service areas.

Seven RAPs ranked this task as being of moderate importance, seven as being of minimal importance, and one, Alaska, thought it to hold major importance. The comments of several SEAs (found in the Collaboration Section of this report) about the value of these committees to their own agencies are noteworthy.

Establish Contact with Directors

ACYF recognized from the beginning that RAPs would have to build and maintain rapport with the directors of the grantees they served; consequently a contract task for six years has required RAPs to attend Head Start directors' meetings. This year the scope of work simply stated that RAPs must maintain contact with directors. RAPs considered contact with directors as moderately important among their other tasks.

During site visits evaluators asked how many Head Start Association meetings RAPs attended, and how else they have maintained contact during this program year.

While recognizing the value in staying in touch with these decision makers, as RAPs have become more responsible for providing services rather than brokering them, their attention has shifted to the personnel who are responsible for the daily well-being of handicapped youngsters in the classroom, i.e., handicap coordinators and teachers. For example, in the Head Start telephone survey the majority of contact persons named by RAPs continue to be handicap coordinators.

The evaluators have been conscious, however, of a regeneration of interest in RAP relationships with Head Start directors. Two issues may contribute to this. First, the Head Start T/TA system is being dismantled, and instead grantees are to be directly funded. RAPs recognize that directors will now be making more decisions about how to spend their training dollars, and also that directors can be enlisted to make certain that teachers follow through with the training the program has bought. Second, collaboration with local community agencies has become increasingly critical in light of two new ACYF initiatives, one to serve more severely handicapped children, and another on the prevention of child abuse and neglect of children with special needs. More than ever, RAPs recognize that commitment must come from the top down in order to adequately meet the needs of children at risk.

RAPs use Head Start directors' meetings at the state, regional, and national levels as areas for contact. All 15 RAPs indicated they had attended or presented at these sessions in 1983-84. Collectively, RAP staff were present at 76 state and regional directors' meetings. The average number each attended was approximately five.

RAPs also characteristically include directors on their mailing lists; some routinely copy everything they send to handicap coordinators to the directors as well. Directors thus receive newsletters, invitations to conferences, and copies of interagency agreements, as well as RAPs' own progress reports and findings from needs assessments of the service area.

Ten RAPs indicated they find occasions to phone their directors, whether for a routine canvass call or to discuss issues of mutual concern to be brought before the directors colleagues. RAPs also use phone contacts to alert directors of upcoming training events, to new program initiatives, and to legislative changes.

Seven RAPs invited directors to mainstreaming conferences, and two designed a whole conference or a whole training day specifically for directors and component coordinators.

RAPs respond to specific requests from Head Start directors when asked, whether they be for materials or technical assistance on writing a proposal for an expansion grant. Directors are included as members on four advisory committees, and at one RAP were

included in meetings with SEA representatives. In the Pacific region where phone and mail communication is difficult, RAP is more dependent on site visits to sustain rapport.

In brief, RAPs see their primary responsibility to directors as keeping them abreast of RAPs' activities and issues so that they may be informed decision makers.

National RAP Meetings

New York City and Santa Fe were the sites of this year's national RAP meetings. These week-long, bi-annual meetings have always been credited with building the RAPs' identity as a network, clarifying goals, and motivating staff. This year was no different for most RAPs, but was notable for the extent and nature of dissatisfaction with the meetings expressed by some RAPs. The network ranked this task as being of moderate importance overall.

The national meetings provide RAP staff with opportunities to share ideas and practices, both formally and informally, to gain fresh perspectives on their work, and to learn about future directions planned by the National Office. Contact with their peers enlarges a project's regional outlook. Common problems can be identified and solved. RAP meetings keep staff in touch with each other and are excellent orientations for new staff. New materials can be introduced and disseminated. Time can be set aside for task force work as well as for the GPO to meet with each project staff individually.

RAP meetings have historically been task-oriented and productive yet rejuvenating for staff. This year's comments, however, suggest that the days were too full and the agendas too inflexible, so that for some the meetings were enervating rather than energizing. Staff at three RAPs reported that the meetings were of little or no benefit this year aside from the possibilities they offered for personal contact and moral support. Days which stretched from breakfast meetings to evening meetings took their toll. There were complaints about the taxing schedule as well as how time was spent in the meetings. A number of comments suggest that a change was perceived in the nature of the RAP meetings this year: "issues weren't tackled"; "no time for discussion"; "unable to be open about issues which needed airing"; "couldn't question, disagree, comment"; and "seems like less communication." The significance of this dissatisfaction was suggested by one comment: "without the opportunity to discuss issues, people feel cheated."

A variety of recommendations were made for designing a more reasonable meeting schedule. These included shortening the length of sessions, restricting the workday from 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., avoiding evening meetings, and substituting an evening session for an afternoon session on at least one day. A strong preference was expressed for setting one day aside specifically for task forces to meet, although when -- at the beginning, the end, or in the middle of the week -- was not agreed upon.

The following recommendations were made about the agenda itself: "design a loose agenda of ISSUES so that if discussion needs to continue, it can"; "allow issues to surface and be talked all the way through"; "avoid having several presentations on the same topic"; "cut out show-and-tell if there are heavy-duty issues which need to be discussed"; "allow people the freedom to disagree and come to agreements"; "leave ample time for in-depth discussion of controversial topics."

RAPs would like to have something included in the meetings specifically for their professional enrichment. Suggestions included scheduling a dynamic speaker, planning

training (e.g., computer, time management, training techniques, leadership), presenting new research, getting an "outsider's" perspective, or even planning an examination of "what we're all doing." Some staff feel the RAP meetings have gotten too large and would prefer to reduce the number of "outsiders" who attend. At the very least, some sessions might be restricted to RAP staff only.

The RAP meetings serve many functions, not the least of which is renewing the network's sense of common purpose. The dissatisfaction expressed this year is unusual, but it seems that it can be remedied if the meetings include sufficient free time, address issues which are important to the RAPs, and allow for more open discussion.

Assist Head Start Grantees with the Annual Survey of Handicapped Children in Head Start

Each year ACYF collects data on the numbers and types of handicapped children enrolled in each Head Start program, types of services provided, and ongoing program needs related to the handicap effort. Formerly conducted as the Annual Survey, ACYF now collects this information about handicap services along with other program information through the Head Start Program Information Report (PIR). Grantees are required to comply with these reporting requirements. Based on information from this survey, The Annual Report on the Status of Handicapped Children in Head Start Programs is prepared and submitted to Congress.

RAPs are required by contract to assist grantees in completing the Annual Survey (for this reason we refer to it as the Annual Survey rather than the PIR). Overall, RAPs rate this task of minimal importance; they are aware, however, that the results of the survey do impact on RAPs when states they serve fail to meet the requirement that 10 percent of the children they enroll in Head Start are handicapped.

At the time of site visits to seven RAPs the questionnaires had not yet been distributed. Of the eight whose grantees had received them, only three RAPs reported that they had been asked for help. Over the course of seven years, there have been relatively few questions. That there are even fewer now may be attributable to the early preparation Head Starts receive from their RAPs.

Five RAPs design and time their own census collection, known as the program profile, to prompt grantees to collect the same data they will ultimately need for the Annual Survey. Others go to greater lengths to brief Head Starts on the types of questions which will appear, as well as interpretations and changes which occur from year to year. For example, one RAP conducts PIR clinics at which they train directors on how to complete the PIR; this RAP also mailed fact sheets on the PIR to their grantees with changes, additions, tips on accuracy, and tools for completion. This year two RAPs explained the purpose of the data collection to new staff at a regional or state conference; and one published an article on the PIR in their newsletter. Another RAP indirectly assists Head Starts with the Annual Survey by working through thorny issues with the Regional Office (e.g., whether the 10 percent calculations are based on actual or funded enrollment).

During this year's Head Start telephone survey, a few Head Starts questioned the necessity of duplicating their efforts in completing the Annual Survey and the RAP program profile. Because there is generally a one year lag time between the collection of Annual Survey data and the publication of findings, RAPs have preferred to collect their own data in order to remain current on the status of the handicap effort in their service areas. However, the RAP census is not a contract requirement. Given the duplication questions which have now arisen, ACYF might examine the options for collecting the information only once in a format which can be used by both RAP and ACYF.

5.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

RAPs have supported, guided, and advocated for Head Start handicap efforts for the past eight years. That they have remained a constant and relevant resource is partially because the network has continued to examine what grantees need now, and to reflect on how to be most helpful in the future.

This year RAPs were asked about future directions the network should take. While there was no consensus on any one priority, five areas emerged more frequently than others:

- Focus - RAP's mission should be clearly delineated and priorities should be set; auxiliary tasks should be dropped from the scope of work so that every major task can be done well.

- Products - Continue developing new products which address current issues; systematically share existing resources so RAPs can build on each others' work.

- Training - Conduct more training-of trainers, and on-site workshops.

- Specific issues - Confront and address specific issues in the field of early childhood special education, e g., an operational definition of severely handicapped children; how RAPs will provide quality assistance to grantees serving children with severely handicapping conditions; problems of transition from Head Start to public schools.

- Head Start directors - Directors will be deciding how to spend their Head Start's PA26 and T/TA funds; directors also play a major role in determining whether teachers follow through on mainstreaming training in the classroom.

In keeping with their conviction that materials and products must be developed to keep pace with timely issues, several RAPs are tentatively planning the following products in 1984-85:

Spanish translation of Talking Between the Lines" (NYU)

Training package to facilitate closer ties between Head Start, Department of Social Services, Foster Care (Chapel Hill)

Training on promoting personal/social skills in handicapped children (Chapel Hill)

Training on increasing skills of Head Start staff to serve siblings in Head Start (Chapel Hill)

Training on use of adaptive equipment for orthopedic handicaps (Chapel Hill)

Training on group-oriented experiences for families (Chapel Hill)

Training on mobilizing volunteers as support aides to families (Chapel Hill)

Slide tape show on RAP (Nashville)

Slide tape for Head Start parents on the Head Start handicap component (Nashville)

Video tape targeting language problems in a group setting to accompany a language development manual (University of Illinois)

Slide tape promoting Head Start which addresses to state and handicap issues (University of Illinois)

Leadership workshop (Portage)

Develop child abuse and neglect slide tape into a Head Start public relations piece (Portage)

Slide tape on stress (Portage)

Slide show for the Teacher Academy (Texas Tech)

A Speech Screening Tool for use by teachers (Texas Tech)

Skill Building Block: Toys for Handicapped Children (Texas Tech)

Skill Building Block: Health (Texas Tech)

Skill Building Block: EPSDT (Texas Tech)

Audio visual on hearing impaired (Region VII)

Videotapes on trainers discussing the difference between screening and assessment, and what screening tools are (Region VII)

Videotapes on RAP training (University of Denver)

Computer program: RAPid File Tracking Material, programmed in BASIC or a commercially available data base system, with instructions (Los Angeles, in collaboration with a local handicap coordinator)

Packets of training materials, collated as modules (Los Angeles)

Management support process for facilitating the integration of handicap components, and a tool covering handicap services plan, budgeting, community needs assessments, etc. (Los Angeles)

Slide show on the Pacific RAP (Pacific)

Special education curriculum for credit for Micronesian trainees (Pacific)

Slide tape to train Micronesian handicap coordinators based on needs which surface in first coordinator meetings (Pacific)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Overall

Data from interviews and records at RAP sites and information from RAP clientele demonstrate that this was a solid year for RAP. Satisfaction from three sources -Head Starts, trainees, and SEAs--increased, remained the same, or dropped very slightly.

State Training Conferences

This year 15,415 participants were trained at 159 conferences maintaining the previous year's level of effort. The majority of these continue to be Head Start teaching staff (66%). Thirty-four percent of all Head Start teachers in the country were trained (6,468) and 21 percent of all teacher aides (3,628). Other Head Start staff trained numbered 5,319. Eighty-six percent of the grantees attended the mainstreaming conferences.

This was the sixth year of wide-scale training on the mainstreaming concepts. Over six years, a total of 77,933 persons have been trained at mainstreaming conferences or their equivalents.

Data from conference evaluations further corroborate attendance patterns. Classroom staff accounted for 66 percent of the trainees. Ninety-eight percent of the sampled conference trainees were Head Start staff.

Fifty percent of the trainees had attended RAP mainstreaming conferences in the past.

Ninety-six percent of the sampled conference trainees rated conferences as "excellent" or "good , identical to last year. The typical trainee expected to change three to four practices as a result of the training.

Budget

The budget for the 1983-84 contract year totaled $2,531,500, increasing the total program budget by 9.8 percent. The budget supported 15 projects and moderate cost of living increases in salaries.

Individual RAP budgets averaged $168,767, compared to $154,493 last year. Budgets ranged from $144,655 to $199,741.

Salaries accounted for 23 percent of new monies. Increases this year in the salary line supported higher wages rather than more staff. Average salary per FTE was $21,556.

This is the first year where new budgets were negotiated after being locked into a three year commitment (whereby costs were contained by a contracting procedure which required RAPs to submit three-year proposals for FY'82 through FY'84).

Task Priorities

For the seventh year the network profile surfaced the same four tasks in top positions (services to Head Start grantees, state training conferences, work plans [which

includes needs assessments], and collaboration). Assistance with the annual survey again ranked last. Other tasks shifted within the middle positions.

Plan of Work

Every RAP submitted a document as required, however, these varied greatly in format and content.

Transitioning was addressed primarily through RAP training.

Collaboration

This year RAPs were involved in the following collaborative activities: SEA/Head Start agreements, other SEA/Head Start collaboration, LEA/Head Start collaboration, and facilitation with other agencies serving handicapped preschoolers.

Four new SEA agreements were signed this year, three of which were between SEAs and ACYF. The total number of SEA/Head Start agreements reported by RAP is 40.

Ten signed, local agreements between a Head Start program and local education agency were directly facilitated by RAP.

Management Information System

Each RAP maintains a computerized management information. All 15 RAPs operate with Apple III hardware and software, and the RAPPLE software program. The 1983-84 program year is the first that the system has been extensively operational.

The RAPPLE software program contains three principal types of information: agencies, (Head Start/non-Head Start), resources, and events (activities and task records.)

All RAPs have entered all Head Starts into the agency data base. All RAPs have entered activities and task records. Fourteen RAPs have entered some providers. Twelve have entered some resources.

National RAP Meetings

Two national RAP meetings were convened this year. The first was held in New York City, New York, in October 1983; the second was held in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in February 1984.

Head Start Directors' Meetings

RAP staff attended 76 state and regional meetings of Head Start Associations.

Resource Provider File

A total of 7,258 entries, including agencies, individuals and materials resources, are catalogued by the RAP network for use by Head Starts. This represents an increase of 344 over the total reported last year.

Of the total number of resources catalogued network-wide, RAPs reported that 725 are used actively, an average of 48 per RAP.

RAP Task Forces

Nine task forces were operational during 1983-1984: PA26; Innovative Approaches to Increasing the Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children; Revision of TN 73.4; Language Development; Child Abuse Track I; Child Abuse Track II; Diagnostic Criteria; Film on Spina Bifida; and RAP/Regional Office Coordination.

Each RAP was assigned to from two to five task forces.

Advisory Committees

In 1983-84, the average RAP advisory committee had 15 members, with sizes of the committees ranging from nine to 31.

All RAPs met the minimum contract requirements for representation on their advisory committee. (Alaska is excepted since their regional office is unable to send a representative due to limited travel funds)

SEA representation on advisory committees is comparable to last year with 44 states and territories. Three RAP advisory committees had representatives from LEAs.

Annual Survey

RAPs received few specific requests for assistance with the annual survey of handicapped children in Head Start. Most RAPs had informed grantees of their availability for assistance and encouraged programs to collect data early to expedite filling out the forms.

Head Start Telephone Survey

Telephone interviews were held with 288 Head Start programs to assess the impact of RAP services.

The overall satisfaction score was 3.5 on a 4 point scale, a slight increase over last year. Ninety-seven percent reported no problems with RAP.

The average number of types of contact between RAPs and Head Starts was 5.0, up significantly from 4.2 last year.

Attendance at mainstreaming conferences continues to be the most frequently cited type of contact (84%); data from the Head Start telephone survey indicate that: 33 percent of the sampled teachers and 26 percent of teacher aides were trained at mainstreaming conferences; 84 percent of the sampled grantees attended.

Training was again most commonly cited as RAP's most valuable service, followed by "others" (e.g., availability), distributon of materials, and information.

SEA Perception of RAP Services

SEAs or their counterparts were contacted in 49 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Confederated States of Micronesia, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Overall satisfaction with RAPs' performance was 3.3 on a four point scale, a slight decrease from 3.5 in 1982-83. Ninety-one percent reported no problems in their dealings with RAP.

The average number of types of contact was 4.2 up slightly from the previous year. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that contacts are mutually initiated; two SEAs reported there had been no contact initiated by RAP during the last year.

Information exchange was the most frequently cited type of contact between RAPs and SEAs (91%); about half (53%) of the respondents attended RAP advisory committee meetings and another 16 percent noted that they were invited, but unable to attend.

Recommendations

Management Information System

Though not fully operational this year, the management information system (MIS) was more extensively utilized than ever before. All RAPs used the RAPPLE programs for recording activities and task records. Not all RAPs entered resource providers and resources. Because of the more extensive use of the system, the need for improvement was apparent in several areas.

1. The program for recording task records needs revision. RAPs should revert to using paper files that allow for the attachment of extensive continuous notes and correspondence. Develop for task records a tally program that permits the manipulation of data without narrative text.

2. The recording of activities is better adapted to the computer than that of task records, but the functions to search and retrieve records is far too slow. Programs should be upgraded or redesigned to search by more criteria and faster.

3. ACYF must monitor the implementation of the system, because many RAPs do not enter data periodically. Two reasons have been raised: 1) the system is not useful, therefore entering data becomes a low priority; 2) staff time is not available to enter data.

4. Support to the RAPs from the contractor for the management of the system has slacked off after a most successful first year. The contractor and ACYF must determine how support can be improved. Some RAPs have suggested an advisory board to the management contractor to consider such questions as: 1) the extent to which RAPPLE meets internal and network needs and 2) what alternatives to RAPPLE are availabe.

5. The original vision of the MIS system is unrealistic. The concept of a "paperless RAP" where staff sit at a terminal and instantly access providers via computer to requestors on the phone is inappropriate because:

- there is only one terminal per RAP.
- the services of resource providers must usually be reviewed before they are given to requestors.
- each transaction must have a paper back-up in the event the disks or programs become defective.

General

There is a need to set priorities among RAPs' contract tasks and to trim back the additional unwritten tasks or provide funding for the additional work.

1. Plan of work - The plan of work should be deleted as a deliverable product. The contract requirement for a plan of work has been met nominally by all RAPs. However, the task is so poorly written in the RFP that the purpose and content of the document is meaningless. The plan of work replaces a task for RAPs to assess the needs of Head Start programs for handicap services.

If there is some purpose of the plan of work (never before required), it should be clearly stated. If not, the necessary and important function of assessing needs should be reinstated. This year RAPs conducted needs assessments without the requirement to do so.

2. Conferences - The relative importance of the task to provide statewide mainstreaming conferences has lost its clear emphasis. RAPs do not know if training teachers and aides continues to be a high priority and if large conference training settings are more desirable to ACYF than small scale training workshops at individual grantees.

3. Initiatives - Several initiatives appear in the 1983-84 scope of work for the first time. They include: facilitating the transition of preschool handicapped children into public schools, improving the capabilities of Head Start grantees to enroll greater numbers of severely handicapped children, outlining a plan for working with each state and at east five local education agencies, contacting preschool and special purpose providers in the region and offering to work cooperatively or provide jointly sponsored training. RAPs have received no guidance on the relative importance of these tasks. Some treat them perfunctorily, others build their plans around one or more initiatives. "Severely handicapped" requires further definition.

If a new initiative is important it should be emphasized at RAP meetings or through written directives. If any are unimportant, they should be eliminated from the RFP.

4. The RAP census, or profile as it has been recently renamed, is a time consuming function for RAPs and grantees and one that duplicates information gathered by ACYF in the PIR. Moreover, it is not a contract requirement, but has been assumed by RAPs to be of importance from verbal guidance given by ACYF. The collection of census data appears to require too much effort with little payoff to RAPs, and none to ACYF. The census should be eliminated as an unwritten requirement or, if it is necessary, should be written into the scope of work and financially supported.

5. Each year RAPs invest time and funds in the development of new products, some of which duplicate others' efforts. ACYF should keep track of proposed products and circulate this information among RAPs.

Task Forces

Task forces have become overwhelming assignments for RAP staff. The scope of each task force could conceivably be a separate contract let by ACYF. The RFP states that in some cases, a contractor may be asked to serve on two task forces. In practice, some RAPs serve on up to five in a given year. ACYF must be selective in establishing task forces and closely manage the progress of each task force.

1. Each task force must have a clear purpose.

2. Time lines for delivering products must be clearly communicated by ACYF to all members.

3. ACYF must take a strong leadership position in monitoring the progress of the task forces.

4. ACYF must financially compensate RAPs for the work required.

5. Membership should be limited to about six per task force.

6. Members should be selected on qualifications of RAP staff. Some members feel unqualified to be on certain task forces while others with qualifications feel overlooked.

7. Although very rewarding to some RAP staff, task forces should be limited to two per RAP, or RAPs should be compensated for the additional burden of membership on more than two.

8. The scope of the assignment should be specific to the common needs of RAPs.

9. Task force members should be on an equal funding status with each other. Never should one RAP be a subcontractor to another.

Appendix A
The RAP Profiles

THE NEW ENGLAND RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: 55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02160
Telephone: (617) 969-7100
Funding Sponsor: Education Development Center (EDC)
Staff: Joanne Brady, Director
Kirsten Hansen, Assistant Director
Meta Steuer, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $177,182; national average: $168.767; rank: 5.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.2; national average: 3.5; rank: 9.

FTE Salary: $23,052; national average: $21,556; rank: 6.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont --- 67,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fourth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 74; national average: 73; rank: 8.

FTE per Head Start: 23; national average: 21; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 2,485; national average: 3,415; rank: 11.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 777; national average: 988; rank: 10.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 1,500; national average: 2,421; rank: 10.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Attend National RAP meetings
Implement Management Information System
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

8 conferences were held, national average 11. 491 teaching staff were trained, representing 47 percent of the teachers and 20 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 279 others were in attendance. 770 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank 10. 66 grantees attended, representing 89 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
37 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
25 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
37 percent others, 40 percent nationally
2 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
39 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
52 percent good, 41 percent nationally
5 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.2 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

208 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
70 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings were held.

Task Force Membership:

Child Abuse and Neglect: Track II
Diagnostic Criteria
PA26
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start
TN 73.4

Head Start Directors Meetings:

2 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 74
Providers - 20
Resources - 70

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction : 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.5, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 5 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 54 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 95 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 55 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.6, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.8 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	School of Continuing Education 3 Washington Square Village, Suite 1M New York, New York 10012
Telephone:	(212) 598-2144
Funding Sponsor:	New York University
Staff:	Judith Rothschild-Stolberg, Director Dinah Heller, Coordinator/Acting Director Michelle Rutman, Resource Specialist Robert Daniels, Social Service Coordinator

Funding Level: $190,501; national average: $168,767; rank: 2.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.3; national average: 3.5; rank: 8.

FTE Salary: $24,491; national average: $21,556; rank: 3.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands --- 61,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; third smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 82; national average: 73; rank: 7.

FTE per Head Start: 25; national average: 25; rank: 4.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 5,370; national average: 3,415; rank: 3.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,627; national average: 988; rank: 2.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 4,384; national average: 2,421; rank: 2.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Establish contact with Head Start directors

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Attend National RAP meetings
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

5 conferences were held, national average 11. 734 teaching staff were trained, representing 25 percent of the teachers and 9 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 757 others were in attendance. 1,491 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank 3. 75 grantees attended, representing 93 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
30 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
18 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
51 percent others, 40 percent nationally
1 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
59 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
37 percent good, 41 percent nationally
2 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.6 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

468 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
45 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development (chair)
Diagnostic Criteria (chair)
TN 73.4
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start (chair)

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:

Head Start grantees	- 82
Providers	- 20
Resources	- 0

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.1, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 10 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 30 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 95 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 67 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.3 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.3, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 1.3 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE REGION III RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Georgetown University Child Development Center CG-52 Bles Building 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007
Telephone:	(202) 625-3639
Funding Sponsor:	Georgetown University Child Development Center
Staff:	Phyllis Magrab, Director Stanley Pryor, Coordinator Roxane Kaufmann, Associate Coordinator Twara Taylor, Information Specialist

Funding Level: $199,741; national average: $168,767; rank: 1.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.4; national average: 3.5; rank: 7.

FTE Salary: $23,196; national average: $21,556; rank: 5.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, D.C., West Virginia --- 123,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fifth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 119; national average: 73; rank: 2.

FTE per Head Start: 35; national average: 21; rank: 2.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 5,088; national average: 3,415; rank: 4.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,496; national average: 988; rank: 3.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,145; national average: 2,421; rank: 6.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

- Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training conferences
- Facilitate collaborative agreements
- Establish contact with Head Start directors
- Attend National RAP meetings
- Participate on RAP task forces

Task identified as having minimal importance:

- Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

9 conferences were held, national average 11. 1,045 teaching staff were trained, representing 43 percent of the teachers and 23 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 422 others were in attendance. 1,467 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 4. 100 grantees attended, representing 84 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
32 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
25 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
42 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
64 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
34 percent good, 41 percent nationally
1 pecent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.6 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

800 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
60 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Child Abuse and Neglect: Track I (chair)

Head Start Directors Meetings:

4 meetings were attended.

Management Information system:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 119
Providers - 26
Resources - 0

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.3, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 19 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 52 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 62 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.8 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.2, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE CHAPEL HILL RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Chapel Hill Training-Outreach Project Lincoln Center, Merritt Mill Road Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
Telephone:	(919) 967-8295
Funding Sponsor:	Carrboro School District
Staff:	Anne Sanford, Director Patricia Mengel, Coordinator Brenda Bowen, Associate Coordinator Pamela Brockington, MIS Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $168,332; national average: $168,767; rank: 7.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.9; national average: 3.5; rank: 5.

FTE Salary: $18,931; national average: $21,556; rank: 12.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina - 191,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; seventh largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 117; national average: 73; rank: 3.

FTE per Head Start: 30; national average: 21; rank: 3.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 4,739; national average: 3,415; rank: 5.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,215; national average: 988; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,691; national average: 2,421; rank: 4.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

- Develop and implement a plan of work
- Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training conferences
- Facilitate collaborative agreements
- Participate on RAP Task Forces

Task identified as having minimal importance:

- Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

10 conferences were held, national average 11. 455 teaching staff were trained, representing 18 percent of the teachers and 6 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 397 others were in attendance. 852 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 9. 101 grantees attended, representing 86 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

95 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
36 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
17 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
42 percent others, 40 percent nationally
5 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average

64 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
31 percent good, 41 percent nationally
2 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.4 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

625 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
50 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

TN 73.4
PA26
Language Development (co-chair)
Child Abuse and Neglect: Track II (chair)
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start
Diagnostic Criteria

Head Start Directors Meetings:

1 meeting was attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 117
Providers - 20
Resources - 25

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 23 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 95 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 67 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.0, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 3.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE NASHVILLE RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Peabody College of Vanderbilt University Post Office Box 317 Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Telephone:	(615) 322-8474
Funding Sponsor:	The Urban Observatory of Metropolitan Nashville-University Center
Staff:	Joseph Cunningham, Director Sharon Innes, Assistant Director Marsha Crownover, Training Coordinator Janet Buckley, Training Specialist

Funding Level: $165,516; national average: $168,767; rank: 10.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.1; national average: 3.5; rank: 4.

FTE Salary: $17,268; national average $21,556; rank: 14.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee --- 132,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; sixth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 84; national average; 73; rank: 6.

FTE per Head Start: 20; national average: 21; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,694; national average: 3,415; rank: 8.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 901; national average: 988; rank: 7.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,851; national average: 2,421; rank: 8.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Establish/update file of resource providers
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Establish contact with Head Start directors

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

8 conferences were held, national average 11. 628 teaching staff were trained, representing 24 percent of the teachers and 20 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 269 others were in attendance. 897 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 8. 73 grantees attended, representing 87 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
39 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
28 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
31 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average

49 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
45 percent good, 41 percent nationally
2 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.8 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

298 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
45 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

RAP/Regional Office Coordination
PA26
Language Development
Diagnostic Criteria
Film

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 84
Providers - 298
Resources - 33

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.8, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 33 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 90 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 81 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.3, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.7, on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE MISSISSIPPI RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Friends of Children of Mississippi, Inc. 119 Mayes Street Jackson, Mississippi 39213
Telephone:	(601) 362-1541
Funding Sponsor:	Chapel Hill Outreach Project subcontracted to the Friends of Children Head Start
Staff:	Anne Sanford, Director Valerie Campbell, Coordinator Gladys Johnson, Associate Coordinator

Funding Level: $149,758; national average: $168,767; rank: 12.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.8; national average: 3.5; rank: 6.

FTE Salary: $18,193; national average: $21,556; rank: 13.

REGIONAL SITUATION

State Served: Mississippi --- 48,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles, second smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 23; national average: 73; rank: 12.

FTE per Head Start: 6; national average: 21; rank: 10.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,221; national average: 3,415; rank: 9.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 848; national average: 988; rank: 8.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,894; national average: 2,421; rank: 7.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Establish/update file of resource providers
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Attend National RAP meetings

Task identified as having minimal importance:

Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

6 conferences were held, national average 11. 567 teaching staff were trained, representing 21 percent of the teachers and 18 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 93 others were in attendance. 660 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 12. 20 grantees attended, representing 87 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
41 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
49 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
8 percent others, 40 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
68 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
32 percent good, 41 percent nationally
0 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 5.4 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

250 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
20 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect: Track II (chair)

Head Start Directors Meetings:

1 meeting was attended, plus 4 sub-committee meetings.

Management Information System:

Date entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 23
Providers - 54
Resources - 0

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.3, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 29 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees attended, 33 percent nationally; 100 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 57 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.0, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 1.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Colonel Wolfe School 403 East Healey Champaign, Illinois 61820
Telephone:	(217) 333-3876
Funding Sponsor:	University of Illinois
Staff:	Merle Karnes, Director Dennis Sykes, Coordinator Deborah Herron, Resource Specialist Niurka Mastrapa, Resource Specialist Sally Parsons, Services Provider/Specialist

Funding Level: $144,655; national average: $168,767; rank: 15.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 5.0 national average: 3.5; rank: 1.

FTE Salary: $15,804; national average: $21,556; rank: 15.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Illinois, Indiana, Ohio --- 132,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; sixth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 115; national average: 73; rank: 4.

FTE per Head Start: 23; national average: 21; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 6,772; national average: 3,415; rank: 1.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,354; national average: 988; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,582; national average: 2,421; rank: 5.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Attend National RAP meetings
Participate on RAP task forces
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

12 conferences were held, national average 11. 1,207 teaching staff were trained, representing 37 percent of the teachers and 30 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 563 others were in attendance. 1,770 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 2. 89 grantees attended, representing 77 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
36 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
24 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
40 percent others, 40 percent nationally
1 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.1 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
18 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
73 percent good, 41 percent nationally
8 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.5 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

537 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
20 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held.

Task Force Membership:

TN 73.4
Language Development

Head Start Directors Meetings:

6 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 115
Providers - 187
Resources - 0

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 75 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 86 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 48 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.0, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 4.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE PORTAGE RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Portage Project
626 Slifer Street
Box 564
Portage, Wisconsin 53901
Telephone: (608) 742-8811
Funding Sponsor: CESA 12
Staff: Neil Schortinghuis, Director
Mary Egan, Training Specialist
Maureen Griffin, Training Specialist
Julia Herwig, Training Specialist

Funding Level: $173,026; national average: $168,767; rank: 6.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.8; national average: 3.5; rank: 2.

FTE Salary: $19,372; national average: $21,556; rank: 11.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin --- 190,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles, seventh smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 85; national average: 73; rank: 5.

FTE per Head Start: 18; national average: 21; rank: 8.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,760; national average: 3,415; rank: 7.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 783; national average: 988; rank: 9.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,454, national average: 2,421; rank: 9.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Participate on RAP Task Forces

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

7 conferences were held, national average 11. 619 teaching staff were trained, representing 31 percent of the teachers and 18 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 545 others were in attendance. 1,154 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 5. 78 grantees attended, representing 92 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
19 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
22 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
59 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
63 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
34 percent good, 41 percent nationally
1 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.5 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

400 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
30 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Child Abuse and Neglect: Track I
Film

Head Start Directors Meetings:

4 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 85
Providers - 143
Resources - 258

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 5 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 27 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 76 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 57 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.8 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 3.7 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Texas Tech University
Institute for Child and Family Studies
Post Office Box 4170
Lubbock, Texas 79409
Telephone: (806) 742-3296
Funding Sponsor: Texas Tech University
Staff: Mary Tom Riley, Director
James Mitchell, Coordinator
Margaret Luera, Coordinator
Marcia Wright, Computer Operator

Funding Level: $148,940; national average: $168,767; rank: 14.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.3, national average: 3.5; rank: 13.

FTE Salary: $24,129; national average: $21,556; rank: 4.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas --- 561,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; second largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 147; national average: 73; rank: 1.

FTE per Head Start: 64; national average: 21; rank: 1.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 5,895; national average: 3,415; rank: 2.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 2,563; national average: 988; rank: 1.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 4,398; national average 2,421; rank: 1.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

- Develop and implement a plan of work
- Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training conferences
- Facilitate collaborative agreements
- Establish contact with Head Start directors
- Attend National RAP meetings
- Participate on RAP Task Forces
- Implement Management Information System
- Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

None

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

20 conferences were held, national average 11. 2,304 teaching staff were trained, representing 57 percent of the teachers and 47 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 405 others were in attendance. 2,709 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 1. 116 grantees attended, representing 79 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
42 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
31 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
24 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
70 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
27 percent good, 41 percent nationally
0 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 4.2 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

1,500 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
40 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
RAP/Regional Office Coordination

Head Start Directors Meetings:

9 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 147
Providers - 300
Resources - 52

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.2 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.4, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 12 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 67 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 52 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.8 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.6, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE REGION VII RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	University of Kansas Medical Center 39th and Rainbow Boulevard, CRU, Room 26 Kansas City, Kansas 66103
Telephone:	(913) 588-5961
Funding Sponsor:	University of Kansas
Staff:	Richard Whelen, Director Glen Ridnour, Co-Director Carol Dermyer, Coordinator BethAnn Smith, Coordinator Marilyn Shankland, Coordinator

Funding Level: $149,523; national average: $168,767; rank: 13.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.1; national average: 3.5; rank: 4.

FTE Salary: $19,596; national average: $21,556; rank: 10.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska --- 285,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fifth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 67; national average: 73; rank: 9.

FTE per Head Start: 16; national average: 21; rank: 9.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 2,722; national average: 3,415; rank: 10.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 664; national average: 988; rank: 11.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 1,230; national average: 2,421; rank: 11.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Facilitate collaborative agreements
Implement Management Information System
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

17 conferences were held, national average 11. 560 teaching staff were trained, representing 46 percent of the teachers and 45 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 370 others were in attendance. 930 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 7. 60 grantees attended, representing 90 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
30 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
33 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
36 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average

49 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
49 percent good, 41 percent nationally
1 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.8 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

612 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
30 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

TN 73.4 (chair)
PA26 (chair)
Child Abuse and Neglect: Track II

Head Start Directors Meetings:

7 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 67
Providers - 0
Resources - 186

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.4, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 10 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 29 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 81 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 62 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.5 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.5, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Denver Research Institute-SSRE Post Office Box 10127 University of Denver Denver, Colorado 80210
Telephone:	(303) 871-3484
Funding Sponsor:	University of Denver
Staff:	Jane Amundson, Director Becky Cook, Coordinator Kostas Messas, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $168,183; national average: $168,767; rank: 8.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.8; national average: 3.5; rank: 11.

FTE Salary: $20,885; national average: $21 556; rank: 7.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming --- 574,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; third largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 56; national average: 73; rank: 10.

FTE per Head Start: 20; national average: 21; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 1,458; national average: 3,415; rank: 13.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 521; national average: 988; rank: 13.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 895 national average: 2,421; rank: 12.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

- Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training conferences
- Participate on RAP Task Forces

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

- Conduct Advisory Committee
- Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

27 conferences were held, national average 11. 402 teaching staff were trained, representing 53 percent of the teachers and 36 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 275 others were in attendance. 677 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 11. 52 grantees attended, representing 93 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

100 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
25 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
19 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
57 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average

59 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
41 percent good, 41 percent nationally
0 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.1 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

160 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
40 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

PA26
Diagnostic Criteria
TN 73.4
Language Development (co-chair)
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start
RAP/Regional Office Coordination

Head Start Directors Meetings:

7 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information system:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 56
Providers - 160
Resources - 455

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.0, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 5 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 65 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 95 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 62 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.6, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.6 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE LOS ANGELES RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	1741 Silverlake Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90026
Telephone:	(213) 664-2937
Funding Sponsor:	Child, Youth and Family Services (CYFS)
Staff:	Beatrice Gold, Director Chris Drouin, Co-Director Joyce Williams, Coordinator Joni Bell, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $183,800; national average: $168,767; rank: 4.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.0; national average: 3.5; rank: 10.

FTE Salary: $27,559; national average: $21,556; rank: 2.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Arizona, California, Nevada --- 383,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fourth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 56; national average: 73; rank: 10.

FTE per Head Start: 19; national average: 21; rank: 7.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 4,218; national average: 3,415; rank: 6.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,406; national average: 988; rank: 4.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,949; national average: 2,421; rank: 3.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Attend National RAP meetings

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

10 conferences were held, national average 11. 569 teaching staff were trained, representing 23 percent of the teachers and 5 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 583 others were in attendance. 1,152 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 6. 51 grantees attended, representing 91 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

97 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
40 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
18 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
40 percent others, 40 percent nationally
2 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
51 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
42 percent good, 41 percent nationally
6 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
1 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.4 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

315 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
10 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Film (chair)
PA26
Diagnostic Criteria
Child Abuse and Neglect: Track I
RAP/Regional Office Coordination

Head Start Directors Meetings:

1 meeting was attended, plus 5 regional meetings.

Management Information System:

Date entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:

Head Start grantees	- 56
Providers	- 6
Resources	- 45

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.9, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 5 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 18 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 81 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 62 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.9 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP 3.7, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 3.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE PACIFIC RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: School of Public Health
University of Hawaii
Biomedical Science Bldg., C-105M
1960 East West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Telephone: (808) 948-8639

Funding Sponsor: University of Hawaii

Staff: Setsu Furuno, Director
Eric Arveson, Coordinator
Mary Lamm, Field Training Specialist
David Roscoe, Field Training Specialist
Francine McMurtry, Training Support Specialist

Funding Level: $186,830; national average: $168,767; rank: 3.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.3; national average: 3.5; rank: 3.

FTE Salary: $20,462; national average: $21,556; rank: 9.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, Pacific Trust Territory, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands --- 7,500 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; smallest geographic area, but spread over millions of square miles in the Pacific.

Number of Grantees: 13; national average: 73; rank: 13.

FTE per Head Start: 3; national average: 21; rank: 11.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 231; national average: 3,415; rank: 14.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 54; national average: 988; rank: 14.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 452; national average: 2,421; rank: 14.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Develop and implement a plan of work
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Establish/update file of resource providers
Implement Management Information System

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

12 conferences were held, national average 11. 227 teaching staff were trained, representing 49 percent of the teachers and 53 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 135 others were in attendance. 362 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 14. 12 grantees attended, representing 92 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

80 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
24 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
17 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
39 percent others, 40 percent nationally
13 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
57 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
41 percent good, 41 percent nationally
0 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 4.1 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

128 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
37 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committees:

3 meetings held (one in each of RAP's service areas).

Task Force Membership:

Diagnostic Criteria
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

6 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Date entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:

Head Start grantees	- 13
Providers	- 128
Resources	- 1,353

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.3. national average 5.0. Problems cited by 8 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 69 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 92 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 69 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.0 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.8, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 3.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Portland State University Post Office Box 1491 Portland, Oregon 97201
Telephone:	(503) 229-4615
Funding Sponsor:	Portland State University
Staff:	Carillon Olmsted, Director Mary Perkins, Coordinator Mary Foltz, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $165,143; national average: $168,767; rank: 10.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.6; national average: 3.5; rank: 12.

FTE Salary: $20,475; national average: $21,556; rank: 8.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Idaho, Oregon, Washington --- 249,000 square miles, national average: 239,000 square miles; sixth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 50; national average: 73; rank: 11.

FTE per Head Start: 19; national average: 21; rank: 7.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 1,473; national average: 3,415; rank: 12.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 567; national average: 988; rank: 12.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 765; national average: 2,421; rank: 13.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Establish contact with Head Start directors
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

7 conferences were held, national average 11. 248 teaching staff were trained, representing 36 percent of the teachers and 29 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 195 others were in attendance. 443 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 13. 42 grantees attended, representing 84 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

100 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
43 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
23 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
34 percent others, 40 percent nationally
0 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
62 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
38 percenvt good, 41 percent nationally
0 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.4 new practices as consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Resource Providers:

255 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 484.
118 providers used actively, national average 46.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect (Tracks I and II)

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 50
Providers - 72
Resources - 350

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.5, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 45 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 81 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 71 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.8 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.7, national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

THE ALASKA RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	620 East 10th Avenue, Suite 203 Anchorage, Alaska 99501
Telephone:	(907) 274-1665
Funding Sponsor:	Easter Seal Society
Staff:	Marion Bowles, Director Sharon Fortier, Co-Director Hilary Hardwick, Coordinator Jill Duthie, Speech Pathologist

Funding Level: $160,370; national average $168,767; rank: 11.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.1, national average 3.5; rank: 14.

FTE Salary: $29,934; national average $21,556; rank: 1.

REGIONAL SITUATION

State Served: Alaska --- 586,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles: largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 3; national average 73; rank: 14.

FTE per Head Start: 1; national average 21; rank: 12.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 97; national average: 3,415; rank: 15.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 46; national average: 988; rank: 15.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 121; national average: 2,421; rank: 15.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

- Develop and implement a plan of work
- Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
- Conduct Advisory Committee
- Establish contact with Head Start directors
- Attend National RAP meetings

Task identified as having minimal importance:

- Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

2 conferences were held, national average 11. 40 teaching staff were trained, representing 45 percent of the teachers and 27 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 34 percent and 21 percent nationally. 31 others were in attendance. 71 total trainees, national average 1,028; rank: 15. 3 grantees attended, representing 100 percent of all grantees, compared to 86 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

94 percent Head Start staff, 98 percent nationally
24 percent teachers, 33 percent nationally
22 percent teacher aides, 24 percent nationally
48 percent others, 40 percent nationally
2 percent non-Head Start staff, 1 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
42 percent excellent, 55 percent nationally
56 percent good, 41 percent nationally
2 percent fair, 2 percent nationally
0 percent poor, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.5 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.3 nationally.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings were held.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
TN 73.4
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

3 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 31, 1984:
Head Start grantees - 3
Providers - 121
Resources - 747

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 11.0, national average 5.0. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 3 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 100 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 33 percent nationally; 100 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 84 percent nationally. 100 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.3 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0 national average 4.2. Frequency of contact: 4.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.7.

Appendix B

SEA Impressions of the RAP Network:
Individual RAP Summaries

New England RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.8	3.0	2.8	1.8
Average no. types of contact	5.6	4.8	5.8	3.8
Satisfaction grade	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.2

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

							6/84 Indexes	
States served	CT	ME	MA	NH	RI	VT	NE RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	O	M	M	O		2.8	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	M	M	M	R			
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5		3.7	3.3
Types of contact							5.6	4.2
AC	x	x	x	x		NO INTERVIEW		
Meetings, etc.	x		x	x				
Materials			x					
SEA/HS collab.			x					
LEA/HS collab.	x		x					
SEA as provider			x	x				
RAP as provider			x	x				
Info exchange	x	x	x	x	x			
Mutual project	x	x	x	x				
SIG								
Other	x		x	x				
Intro contact								
None								

Most Valuable Service

Connecticut: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Rhode Island: RAP as a resource to Head Start; training.

Massachusetts: A place for people to turn to when they need help.

New Hampshire: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

Maine: RAP as a resource to SEA; training.

Suggestions

Connecticut: Maintain ongoing contact.

Massachusetts: More staff and funding.

Maine: Need to spend more time on-site in Maine.

New Hampshire: More dissemination about what goes on in the rest of the region.

Rhode Island: RAP could help with the classification of language problems.

New York University RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	1.3	2.5	3.0	4.0
Average no. types of contact	3.3	4.5	5.5	5.5
Satisfaction grade	2.3	4.0	3.0	3.3

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	NJ	NY	PR	VI	6/84 Indexes N.Y.U. RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	I	M+	N	N	1.3	2.7
Initiator of contact	R	M	N	N		
Satisfaction grade	3.0	4.0	N.O.	N.O.	2.3	3.3
Types of contact					3.3	4.2
AC	x	x				
Meetings, etc.		x				
Materials	x	x				
SEA/HS collab.		x				
LEA/HS collab.						
SEA as provider	x	x				
RAP as provider		x				
Info exchange	x	x				
Mutual project						
SIG						
Other		x				
Intro contact						
None			x	x		

Most Valuable Service

New Jersey: RAP serves as a liaison between LEA/SEA and Head Start.

New York: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; training.

Virgin Islands: SEA unable to respond because of little contact.

Suggestions

Puerto Rico: Need more information before knowing how to coordinate together.

Virgin Islands: If RAP could facilitate interagency cooperation, would really like their help. Would like to know what their role is.

Region III RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.0
Average no. types of contact	4.2	3.6	4.0	4.2
Satisfaction grade	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.6

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	DE	DC	MD	PA	VA	WV	6/84 Indexes R III RAP	6/84 Indexes NAT'L
Frequency of contact	O	M	M+	O	M	I	2.5	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	M	M	M	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.3
Types of contact							4.2	4.2
AC		x						
Meetings, etc.				x				
Materials		x	x	x	x	x		
SEA/HS collab.		x		x	x			
LEA/HS collab.								
SEA as provider								
RAP as provider				x				
Info exchange	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project		x	x		x			
SIG					x			
Other	x	x		x				
Intro contact					x			
None								

Most Valuable Service

District of Columbia: Their knowledge of preschool handicap children; technical assistance and resources they make available to handicapped children.

Delaware: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; advisory committee is an excellent way for members of states to get together and share information and support each other.

Maryland: Commitment to advocacy for children.

Pennsylvania: Availability.

Virginia: Information on resource providers; materials.

West Virginia: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Suggestions

Pennsylvania: Would like a newsletter on news of what RAP is doing.

Virginia: More follow-up with SEA.

Maryland: Advocate for expansion of services for high risk children.

West Virginia: Like a brochure on what RAP does.

Chapel Hill RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.5	2.8	2.7	3.3
Average no. types of contact	6.0	4.8	5.7	4.5
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	FL	GA	NC	SC	6/84 Indexes CH RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M+	0	M+	3.5	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	M	S	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.3
Types of contact					6.0	4.2
AC	x	x	x			
Meetings, etc.	x	x	x	x		
Materials	x	x		x		
SEA/HS collab.	x	x				
LEA/HS collab.	x					
SEA as provider	x	x	x			
RAP as provider	x		x			
Info exchange	x		x	x		
Mutual project		x				
SIG	x					
Other	x					
Intro contact						
None						

Most Valuable Service

Florida: RAP serves as a resource to SEA; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start; collaboration; materials.

Georgia: Collaboration; training; information.

North Carolina: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start; training.

South Carolina: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; training; materials.

Suggestions

Florida: Encourage RAP to be the facilitator of one instate planning meeting between SEA, RAP and SFC.

Georgia: Funds to make RAP services available to public schools.

North Carolina: Continue to assist with policy issues, e.g., how to resolve the problem of not being able to place children in Head Start because of teacher certification.

Nashville RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.7	2.7	.7	1.0
Average no. types of contact	5.3	4.3	1.0	1.0
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.7	2.5	2.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/84 Indexes	
States served	AL	KY	TN	NASH RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	O	M	2.7	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	R	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.3
Types of contact				4.3	4.2
AC	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x			
Materials	x	x			
SEA/HS collab.	x				
LEA/HS collab.	x				
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider					
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project	x				
SIG	x		x		
Other	x				
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

Alabama: RAP as a liaison between SEA and Head Start; RAP is a neutral entity to help with problems.

Kentucky: RAP as a resource to SEA.

Tennessee: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; contribution to the effort to promote special education for handicapped preschoolers in the state.

Mississippi RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Average no. types of contact	2.0	2.0	3.0	8.0
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interview

		6/84 Indexes	
State served	MS	MS RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	I	1.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	M		
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.5	3.3
Types of contact		2.0	4.2
AC	x		
Meetings, etc.			
Materials			
SEA/HS collab.			
LEA/HS collab.			
SEA as provider			
RAP as provider			
Info exchange	x		
Mutual project			
SIG			
Other			
Intro contact			
None			

Most Valuable Service

Mississippi: RAP as a resource to Head Start.

The University of Illinois RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	4.0	3.7	2.3	3.0
Average no. types of contact	6.0	5.0	4.3	5.7
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/84 Indexes	
States served	IL	IN	OH	U OF I RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M+	M+	4.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.3
Types of contact				6.0	4.2
AC	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x	x		
Materials	x	x			
SEA/HS collab.	x				
LEA/HS collab.		x			
SEA as provider		x			
RAP as provider		x			
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project					
SIG					
Other	x	x			
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

Indiana: Sharing information.

Illinois: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start.

Ohio: RAP as a resource to SEA.

Suggestions

Ohio: Want regional office to attend advisory committee meetings.

Portage RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.3
Average no. types of contact	5.0	4.5	3.3	3.7
Satisfaction grade	3.8	4.0	3.5	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/84 Indexes	
States served	MI	MN	WI	PORT RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M+	M+	3.7	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	R	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.3
Types of contact				5.0	4.2
AC	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x			
Materials		x	x		
SEA/HS collab.	x	x			
LEA/HS collab.	x				
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider			x		
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project			x		
SIG					
Other			x		
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

- Michigan: RAP as resource to Head Start; RAP as a liaison between SEA and Head Start; materials; being an outside observer of operations in the state.

  Wisconsin: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; good knowledge of resource providers.

Minnesota; Training; materials.

Suggestions

Minnesota: Would like to know their scope of work.

Michigan: Education Coordinators need to be drawn into the IEP process. Suggest Education Coordinators receive RAP training. Mainstreaming conferences should run at two levels for experienced and new staff.

Wisconsin: RAP should send out to new advisory committee members background materials on RAP so older members don't have to review it again.

Texas Tech RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8
Average no. types of contact	2.6	4.3	2.0	2.6
Satisfaction grade	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.3

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

						6/84 Indexes	
States served	TX	AR	LA	NM	OK	TT RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	O	I	M+	O	I	2.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	R	M	R	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	N.O. 1.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.8	3.3
Types of contact						2.6	4.2
AC							
Meetings, etc.			x				
Materials		x	x	x			
SEA/HS collab.							
LEA/HS collab.							
SEA as provider							
RAP as provider			x				
Info exchange	x	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project			x				
SIG			x				
Other			x				
Intro contact							
None							

Most Valuable Service

New Mexico: Materials; training.

Arkansas: Don't know.

Oklahoma: Training.

Louisiana: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; technical assistance on the special project.

Texas: Training; RAP as a liaison between SEA and Head Start.

Suggestions

Arkansas: Would be valuable to bring SEAs together to share experiences.

Oklahoma: Want more contact from RAP. Need more services in Oklahoma. RAP should initiate a preplanning meeting for Head Start and SEA.

Region VII RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	1.6	3.5	3.3	2.0
Average no. types of contact	4.3	4.8	6.0	4.0
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.4

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	IA	KS	MO	NE	6/84 Indexes R. VII RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	O	I	M+	1.6	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	S	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	2.0	3.0	N.O. 1.0	4.0	3.5	3.3
Types of contact					4.3	4.2
AC	x	x		x		
Meetings, etc.	x			x		
Materials				x		
SEA/HS collab.				x		
LEA/HS collab.						
SEA as provider						
RAP as provider		x				
Info exchange	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project		x		x		
SIG						
Other	x	x				
Intro contact						
None						

Most Valuable Service

- Missouri: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; training.
  Kansas: RAP serves as a resource to the Head Start.

Iowa: RAP serves as a resource to SEA; RAP as a liaison between SEA and Head Start.

Nebraska: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start; materials.

Suggestions

Kansas: Be sure to include LEA special education staff when visiting a community.

Missouri: Rethink training in terms of training of trainors.

Nebraska: Would like to share data on computers.

University of Denver RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.5
Average no. types of contact	2.6	3.8	4.0	3.3
Satisfaction grade	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.8

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

							6/84 Indexes	
States served	CO	MT	ND	SD	UT	WY	U of D RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	I	O	I	O	O	2.6	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	M	M	R	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	3.5	N.O.	3.0	3.5	3.6	3.3
Types of contact							2.6	4.2
AC			x					
Meetings, etc.	x		x		x	x		
Materials	x							
SEA/HS collab.	x		x					
LEA/HS collab.	x							
SEA as provider	x							
RAP as provider								
Info exchange	x	x	x	x	x			
Mutual project	x							
SIG	x							
Other								
Intro contact								
None								

Most Valuable Service

North Dakota: RAP as a resource to Head Start; availability of resources.

South Dakota: Don't know.

Colorado: RAP as a resource to SEA; wealth of expertise on models for mainstreaming.

Montana: RAP as resource for information to SEA; RAP as a resource to Head Start.

Utah: Not enough contact.

Wyoming: Availability.

Suggestions

South Dakota: Would like some information about who they are.

Colorado: More community training with RAP.

Los Angeles RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.0	3.3	1.7	3.0
Average no. types of contact	3.7	4.7	5.0	4.7
Satisfaction grade	2.9	3.7	3.5	3.5

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/84 Indexes	
States served	AZ	CA	NV	LA RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	O	M+	M	3.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	R	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	2.5	3.8	2.5	2.9	3.3
Types of contact				3.7	4.2
AC	x	x			
Meetings, etc.		x	x		
Materials			x		
SEA/HS collab.					
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider					
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project		x			
SIG		x			
Other		x			
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

- California: Training.

  Arizona: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

  Nevada: Training

Suggestion

Arizona: Time for RAP to become more active in the state. Would like more help on monitoring rules and regulations.

Pacific RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.0
Average no. types of contact	3.8	3.0	5.0	2.7
Satisfaction grade	3.0	2.5	3.3	2.8

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

6/84 Indexes

States served	HI	GU	NMI	PTT	AS	MARIANA	PONAPE	PACIFIC RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	O	N	M+	O	M+	M	3.5	2.7
Initiator of contact	M	R	NA N.O.	S	M	R	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	N.O.	3.0	3.3
Types of contact								3.8	4.2
AC				x	x				
Meetings, etc.	x	x		x	x		x		
Materials	x				x		x		
SEA/HS collab.	x					x			
LEA/HS collab.									
SEA as provider									
RAP as provider	x								
Info exchange	x	x		x	x	x	x		
Mutual project	x						x		
SIG									
Other					x				
Info contact									
None			x						

Most Valuable Service

Hawaii: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start; facilitator between Head Start, SEA and other resource providers.

Pacific Trust Territory: Training.

Ponape: Disseminating information.

Mariana: Don't know.

Guam: Training; RAP as a resource to Head Start.

American Samoa: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; training; RAP gave SEA a better understanding of Head Start health and mainstreaming policies.

Suggestions

Pacific Trust Territory: Need for better coordination of training activities.

Northern Mariana Islands: Don't use trainers from outside. Train on more fundamental level. Involve SEA in planning and delivery of training. Funnel training through community college. Would like to be invited to training.

American Samoa: More contact; more on-site work and more coordination for on-site visits; consider an alaternative time for summer workshop.

Guam: Need for stronger better way of communicating

Ponape: Need better communication to know what service is available and when it will be delivered. Maybe a catalogue of service providers would be helpful.

Problem

Northern Mariana Islands: Very positive personal contact, but the situation remains the same. Head Start needs more basic training geared at maximum to the high school level. Needs training on administrative level.
Thought RAP would involve community college but it hasn't.

Pacific Trust Territory: Didn't provide summer training that was planned.

Portland State University RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	2.0	2.3	1.0
Average no. types of contact	4.7	3.0	3.0	2.0
Satisfaction grade	2.8	2.5	2.7	3.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/84 Indexes	
States served	ID	OR	WN	PSU RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	I	M	O	2.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	S	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	N.O. 1.0	4.0	3.5	2.8	3.3
Types of contact				4.7	4.2
AC					
Meetings, etc.					
Materials	x	x			
SEA/HS collab.		x			
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider		x			
RAP as provider		x			
Info exchange		x	x		
Mutual project		x	x		
SIG			x		
Other		x			
Intro contact			x		
None					

Most Valuable Service

Washington: RAP as a resource to SEA and to Head Start; RAP as a liaison between SEA and Head Start; training.

Oregon: RAP's support toward getting some common procedures established in the field.

Idaho: SEA unable to respond because of lack of contact with RAP.

Suggestion

Idaho: Not familiar enough with RAP, don't know their goals.

Alaska RAP

	6/84	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
Average no. types of contact	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interview

		6/84 Indexes	
State served	AK	AK RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	4.0	2.7
Initiator of contact	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	3.3
Types of contact		5.0	4.2
AC	x		
Meetings, etc.			
Materials			
SEA/HS collab.	x		
LEA/HS collab.			
SEA as provider			
RAP as provider			
Info exchange	x		
Mutual project	x		
SIG	x		
Other			
Intro contact			
None			

Most Valuable Service

Alaska: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; provision of TA to school districts; locating and identifying children 0-5 years in the state.